SHL
WITHDRAWN

63 Periodicals
Royal

23 JUL 1979

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/royal-historical-society-london-england-transactions_1903_17

TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

The Society as a body is not responsible for the opinions advanced in the following pages.

TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

New Series.

VOL. XVII.

LONDON:
OFFICES OF THE SOCIETY,
3 OLD SERJEANTS' INN, CHANCERY LANE, W.C.

CONTENTS

PAGE

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS. By G. W. PROTHERO, Litt.D., LL.D. vii

THE ENGLISH PREMONSTRATENSIANS. By the Right Rev. FRANCIS AIDAN GASQUET, D.D. 1

THE INTELLECTUAL INFLUENCE OF ENGLISH MONASTICISM BETWEEN THE TENTH AND THE TWELFTH CENTURIES. By MISS R. GRAHAM 23

ROYALIST AND CROMWELLIAN ARMIES IN FLANDERS—1657–1662. By C. H. FIRTH, LL.D. 67

THE DEVELOPMENT OF INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE IN WALES DURING THE MIDDLE AGES. By E. A. LEWIS 121

ITALIAN BANKERS AND THE ENGLISH CROWN. By ROBERT JOWITT WHITWELL, F.R.HIST.SOC. 175

BONDMEN UNDER THE TUDORS. By ALEXANDER SAVINE . 235

INDEX 291

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL 325

INFORMATION RESPECTING THE SOCIETY 335

CHARTER OF INCORPORATION 343

BY-LAWS 349

OFFICERS AND COUNCIL 355

LIST OF FELLOWS 358

LIST OF SUBSCRIBING LIBRARIES 372

TRANSACTIONS AND PUBLICATIONS OF THE SOCIETY . . 379

PUBLICATIONS OF LEARNED SOCIETIES, PERIODICALS, &C. . 391

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

By G. W. Prothero, Litt.D., LL.D.

Delivered February 19, 1903

On this occasion, last year, when I first had the honour of addressing you from this chair, I deplored the loss of two of our leading historians—the Bishops of Oxford and London—both of whom were Fellows of our Society. Since that date two other great men, to whose illness I then referred, have been removed from us—Lord Acton and Dr. S. R. Gardiner. To my last year's address, as delivered, I ventured subsequently to add some remarks on these notable writers and men of learning, and will therefore on the present occasion do no more than remind you of their deaths, and express the hope that we may, to the best of our powers, follow their example and imitate their high endeavours in the cause of historical science.

I regret that our ranks have been further impoverished by the deaths of Mr. B. F. Stevens, F.S.A., for many years a helpful Councillor; of Colonel John Davis, F.S.A.; of Mr. J. J. Cartwright—formerly Treasurer of the Camden Society and Secretary—of the Record Office and Historical MSS. Commission; and of M. de Maulde la Clavière, the active secretary of the Société de l'Histoire Diplomatique, who was a corresponding member of our Society. On the other hand, I am happy to say that our membership has been recently strengthened by the adhesion of several scholars of distinction; and I trust that their good example may soon be followed by others.

The scheme for the Promotion of Advanced Historical

Study—the origin of which I described to you a year ago—has been carried on during the last year with marked success. Although this excellent work is not one in which the Society, in its corporate capacity, can take part, its success must be a matter of interest to all historians, and particularly to ourselves; for those who have been active in its promotion are, almost without exception, members of our body. Our literary director, Mr. Hubert Hall, to whose devotion and learning the Society owes so much, holds one of the two lectureships which have been established; Mr. I. S. Leadam, a member of our Council, holds the other. Their classes have been well attended, and the results afford good ground for hoping that the ends we have had in view may be attained, so far as it is possible under the restricted conditions due to the scantiness of our funds. In this connection I may call your attention to the Report recently issued by the Parliamentary Commission appointed to investigate the existing arrangements for the collection and custody of Local Records, and to consider further measures which it may be advisable to take for this purpose. This Report places in the forefront of its requirements the establishment of some institution resembling the École des Chartes in Paris, to teach Palæography, Diplomatics, and the science of ancient documents in general. This is the very object which the promoters of the Scheme for Advanced Historical Teaching have in view.

A work of no special historical interest, it is true, but one of considerable importance to the Society, has been carried through during the past year. I refer to the revision of our By-laws, which was undertaken by the Council, and approved by a special meeting of the Society held on May 15, 1902. The work was rendered advisable by defects and obscurities in the old rules, which in certain contingencies might have landed the Society in difficult or disagreeable situations; and the opportunity was taken for a general revision, which did not however lead to any serious or sweeping changes. One of the most interesting results was the creation of a new class of Honorary Vice-Presidents. This

enables us to confer such distinction as it is in our power to bestow on some of our most prominent members, without at the same time imposing upon them the duty—inseparable from the position of Vice-President under the old rules—of acting as members of the Council.

Among other events interesting to the Society, I may mention the presentation of a loyal and dutiful Address to our patron, King Edward VII., on the occasion of his Majesty's coronation; the celebration of the Jubilee of the Owens College, Manchester, which was attended by representatives of the Society, and occasioned the publication of a valuable collection of historical essays by graduates of the Victoria University, among whom several of our members were conspicuous; and the gathering at Oxford, in October last, of a large company of librarians and scholars from Europe, America, and other parts of the world, on the occasion of the tercentenary of the foundation of Bodley's Library. At this meeting your President had the honour of representing the Society.

Such is a brief chronicle of events during the past year which appear to have a more particular interest for our Society. I would gladly dwell on the progress made by historical learning during the same period; on the notable books which have been written; the new and remarkable evidences of the past which have been brought to light. But, in view of what I have to say on another topic, I forbear entering upon a field in which I might easily stray beyond the limits of your patience and my time.

A Bibliography of British History

I pass to the principal matter that I wish to lay before you to-day—a proposal for a bibliography of British history since the end of the Middle Ages. The need of such an aid to historical students of all classes, whether British or foreign, from the undergraduate who is reading for the schools to the scientific worker engaged in original research, must

have been constantly present to the minds of all of us. The idea has long been in my own head; and I cannot help feeling that the time has come when we, if not as a corporate body representing the study of history in this country, at least as individuals having the furtherance of that study at heart, should endeavour to remove what appears to me a blot on our fame as historians, a crying defect in our scientific literature—the want of such a bibliography.

I am aware that I am not the first person to make such a proposal, and that this is not even the first occasion on which such a proposal has been laid before this Society. So far back as 1885 Mr. Tedder, librarian of the Athenæum—now, I am glad to say, a Fellow of our Society—read before the meeting of the Library Association at Plymouth a paper entitled 'Proposals for a Bibliography of National History.'[1] This paper gives a very valuable and instructive synopsis of the literature of the subject. The author, after mentioning the most important general treatises on historical bibliography, in English as well as in other languages, discusses briefly the chief bibliographical works bearing on the historical literature of separate European countries, and, in somewhat greater detail, those bearing on British history. He then lays down the principles on which a National Bibliography of British History should be based—principles which in the main I heartily endorse, and to which I shall have occasion to return presently. He concludes with an estimate of the space which such a bibliography would probably fill and of its probable cost.

Four years later, in a review of Gabriel Monod's 'Bibliographie de l'Histoire de France,'[2] Mr. Tedder recurred to the subject. After recounting the works of M. Monod's chief predecessors in France he discussed the best methods of classification as applied to French history, and especially commended M. Monod's double system—a system which he copied from Dahlmann—under which historical works are

[1] Published in the *Library Chronicle*, iii. 185.
[2] Published in the *Library* (1889), i. 15.

grouped first under subjects and then under periods. I make no apology for referring at some length to Mr. Tedder's two most suggestive papers, since they are only to be found in periodicals not readily accessible, and are unlikely to be familiar to many here present.

It is different with the other paper, to which I have already alluded, the 'Proposal for a New Historical Bibliography,' read by Mr. Frederic Harrison before this Society in November 1896, and published in the Society's 'Transactions' (new series, vol. xi.) Doubtless some who are here to-day heard the paper read, and any member of the Society can study it at his leisure. It is, therefore, unnecessary to do more than refer to this admirable summary and cogent argument in favour of such an enterprise as I am now considering, and to say that, in the main, the principles that Mr. Harrison lays down agree with those set forth by Mr. Tedder. What the reasons were which prevented these proposals from bearing any fruit except that of conviction in the minds of those who heard them I do not know; but the need has not grown less—except in one important particular, to which I shall presently recur—in the years since they were made.

It used to be a general belief that the English were the most practical people on the face of the earth, and the average Englishman still cherishes this conviction, on no better grounds than because whatever difficulties we get into we always 'muddle through somehow.' He forgets that to 'muddle through somehow' is the most unpractical thing in the world. Whatever we are, we are *not* practical in the higher and more positive sense of the word. No doubt, in a sense, the average Englishman, taken by himself, is practical. He does not readily lose his head in emergencies; he can contrive and invent—or could do so, at least, before the genius of invention crossed the Atlantic. He has a happy knack for governing inferior races; he has a genius for reconciling, in political matters, 'imperium et libertatem'; he can run an ordinary business with a due mixture of

caution and enterprise. But of the higher practicality, which consists in forethought, preparation, system, the qualities which make for national efficiency, he has, I fear, but a very small share. He takes routine for method, tradition for experience, habits for principles; he calls a man of ideas a star-gazer, and stigmatises foresight as speculation; and he instinctively shrinks from, if he does not actively detest, education in general, and all knowledge that does not bear directly on the subject that he has in hand.

To discuss these national deficiencies further would take me a long way out of my course; I have only considered them so far because they are exemplified in the particular defect I am pressing on your notice—the want of a bibliography of British history.

The aggregate of historical works bulks large in our national literature, and many of our greatest writers have been historians, from the days of Bede and Alfred, through those of Camden and Bacon, of Clarendon and Hume, to those of Grote and Arnold, of Macaulay and Froude and Freeman. The history of our country is, to say no more, at least as worthy of study, as instructive, as educational, as that of France or Germany. But it has never been systematised, it has never been effectively encouraged by the State, it has never been adequately incorporated in the national system of education, or even (till recently) in the curriculum of our older universities, as it has in those two countries.

Putting aside the want of encouragement from the State, and the inadequate place that history holds in the system of national education, I remark that the study has not been properly systematised. The blame for this must rest mainly on historical students themselves. That very individualism of ours which in some respects is a strength is in others a weakness, for it hinders that co-operation which is generally necessary to the accomplishment of great comprehensive works. Our own Society is not yet thirty-five years old, and till recently a good many prominent scholars stood aloof from it. The 'English Historical Review' is only sixteen years

old. It was only the other day that we established the humble beginnings of a school of historical method. And, in spite of Mr. Mullinger and Professor Gross, we have not yet got a Bibliography of British History at once adequate and general; for Mr. Mullinger's Introduction, admirable as it is in its way, does not pretend to be complete; while Mr. Gross's book, almost perfect so far as it goes, does not take us beyond the Middle Ages.

Now of all the aids to study and research none is more generally and readily useful, none, one may say, so indispensable, as a full and accurate bibliography. To study such a subject as history without a bibliography is for the beginner, and even for the fairly advanced student, like being turned loose in a library without a catalogue. The *Forscher* —the 'researcher,' if one may use the word—must know what has already been done on the subject of his research, or after months of toil he may find that his results have been anticipated. The Royal Society have long recognised the need of such a help in natural science, and this year have, in conjunction with the great foreign societies, published the first numbers of a vast International Scientific Catalogue, which is to embody, year by year, the scientific productions of the whole world. Such a work is rendered possible only by the most carefully organised system of co-operation, which concentrates the labours of a large body of workers in all civilised countries of the world. That co-operation on such a scale and with such an object is possible is, indeed, in more ways than one, a hopeful sign. Cannot we import something of this spirit into our own province, and utilise it for a similar end?

In this matter of bibliographies we are, as a nation, amazingly badly off. Mr. Tedder enumerates more than a dozen general historical bibliographies, mostly German, but also French and Italian, all of importance. In English he mentions four, two of which are translations from eighteenth-century works in French; one is Hearne's 'Ductor Historicus,' published in 1704; and the fourth is Mr. C. K. Adams's

'Manual of Historical Literature' (1882). I find that Petzholdt's useful compilation, the 'Bibliotheca Bibliographica,' published in 1866, devotes 105 pages to historical bibliographies, among which bibliographies of a general nature and those on special departments of history occupy eighteen pages. Out of some eighty or a hundred items on these pages two are English, one being a bibliography attached to a catalogue of a private collection, the other a bibliography of books on heraldry. Under the heading of 'Bibliographies of National History,' arranged under the different countries, those of Germany fill twenty-one pages, those of France eight, while the English are comprised in three; and of these most belong to the eighteenth century, while only one—Sir T. Duffus Hardy's famous catalogue of MSS. down to 1327—is still of any real use. It is hardly necessary to say that we have nothing in English at all corresponding to the 'Bibliotheca Historica,' the annual catalogue issued by the booksellers of Germany since 1851; still less to that magnificent work annually put forth since the year 1878 by the Historical Society of Berlin—the 'Jahresberichte der Geschichtswissenschaft'—which contains not only a classified list of all historical works, including magazine articles, published during the year, but notes of their contents and adequate estimates of their value. Nor have we anything in English like Bernheim's 'Lehrbuch der historischen Methode,' or even like that useful and admirable little book the 'Manuel de Bibliographie Historique,' lately published by M. Langlois and the 'Introduction aux Études Historiques,' by MM. Langlois and Seignobos, which we have had to translate into English.

With bibliographies of national as distinct from general history most European nations with any claim to scientific rank are fairly well supplied. But in England, omitting, of course, such special works as Mr. Scargill Bird's invaluable 'Guide to the Documents in the Public Record Office,' we have no modern bibliography of any real value, except Mr. Mullinger's 'Introduction'; and far the most com-

plete bibliography of English history in existence is the 'Catalogue de l'Histoire de la Grande-Bretagne,' a section of the great classified catalogue of the National Library in Paris. This list contains—or contained in 1878—no less than 12,489 entries, nearly four times the number of those mentioned by Mr. Gross, and about ten times the number to be found in Mr. Mullinger. In other words, if we want an adequate list of books on our national history we must go to Paris for it, or at least consult a French catalogue.

Since Mr. Tedder wrote, and even since Mr. Harrison put forward his proposal, this reproach has been removed from British historical literature, so far as the Middle Ages are concerned, by the publication of Mr. Gross's admirable book 'The Sources and Literature of English History from the Earliest Times till about 1485.' But by whom has it been removed? Not, alas! by an Englishman, but by an American. Mr. Gross, an ornament of the University of Harvard, has done for English history what no Englishman has done, or even (so far as I know) essayed; for Mr. Mullinger's 'Introduction' aims at an entirely different mark—it contains only some 1,000 or 1,200 entries—while such slight compilations as Mr. Airy's 'Books on English History' cannot in any way be compared with the great work of Mr. Gross.

I have dwelt at some length on this part of my subject in order to impress upon you our backwardness in this particular department—a dull, perhaps, but indispensable department—of historical work, and to enforce the duty of making good our defect without further loss of time. Fortunately—and this is certainly one advantage of being late in the field—we have good models to imitate; and it is even possible that we may be able, by a careful examination of these models, to improve on them in some particulars. We should at least make it our aim not to fall below them. Let us then, before we consider the principles which should govern the construction of our bibliography, examine briefly those on which the

best existing bibliographies are based. If we ever undertake this work, a far more extensive and detailed survey will be necessary.

I eliminate from this comparison such monumental works as Potthast's 'Bibliotheca Historica Medii Ævi,' because it is a general, not national bibliography, and is confined to the Middle Ages; Wattenbach's 'Deutsche Geschichtsquellen,' because it is only concerned with MSS. to the middle of the thirteenth century; Chevalier's vast 'Bio-Bibliographie' and 'Topo-Bibliographie'—to the utility of which, in spite of their great defects, Mr. Harrison perhaps hardly did justice—because they have special objects, indicated by their titles, in view; Franklin's 'Sources de l'Histoire de France,' a most useful book—somewhat strangely omitted by Mr. Gross in his list of books on the history of neighbouring nations—because it deals almost exclusively with lists, such as that of the National Library, or great collections of archives, documents, chronicles or memoirs, such as those of D'Achery, Pertz, Petitot, Buchon, and the publications of learned societies; and Sir T. Duffus Hardy's 'Catalogue,' because it only reaches the year 1327, and is primarily a catalogue of MSS. giving in an appendix the titles of such as have been printed.

I choose for examination and comparison (1) The 'Catalogue de l'Histoire de France,' published by order of the Emperor Napoleon III., between 1855 and 1870; (2) the admirable work originated by Dahlmann in 1830, continued by Waitz, and now brought up to date in a sixth edition (1894) by Steindorff—the 'Quellenkunde der deutschen Geschichte'; (3) M. Gabriel Monod's 'Bibliographie de l'Histoire de France,' which is confessedly compiled on the model of the German work; (4) M. H. Pirenne's 'Bibliographie de l'Histoire de Belgique' (1902); (5) Larned's 'Literature of American History' (1902); (6) and lastly, as coming nearest to our own particular subject, Mr. Charles Gross's 'Sources and Literature of English History.'

(1) *Catalogue de l'Histoire de France.*—I mention this first, not because it is a work which we can imitate, or should

wish to imitate, for it is on such a scale as could not be undertaken save by the Government, or some public institution subsidised by government funds. It is in eleven volumes quarto, and contains notices of over 187,000 works. I mention it for the sake of showing what might and should be done by an enlightened government, anxious to promote learning; because such a work, if we had anything like it in this country, would form a unique basis for such a bibliography as we contemplate; and because it exemplifies in a remarkable way the French genius for arrangement and system.

It was not the first great French historical bibliography, for the Oratorian Jacques Lelong had published, in 1719, his 'Bibliothèque Historique de la France,' which between fifty and sixty years later was republished, in a greatly enlarged form, by a lawyer, M. Fevret de Fontette. Nor is it the last historical bibliography issued by a public authority in France, for in 1885 the Ministry of Public Instruction put forth a 'Répertoire des Travaux Historiques . . . sur l'Histoire . . . de France,' a very useful work, but one of far smaller dimensions.

The 'Catalogue' is divided into fifteen chapters, each of which falls into a number of sections. It begins with two general chapters—(1) bibliographies, general treatises on France, geographical and descriptive works, statistics, general histories, collections of documents, chronicles, &c.; (2) lists of works dealing with epochs of French history—the Gauls, the Franks, the Capetian kings, the Crusades, the wars with England, the League, the Revolution, &c., or with several reigns. The third chapter, which, divided into twelve chronological sections, occupies nearly three volumes, gives the authorities for separate reigns, and is followed by (chap. 4) lists of journals and other periodical publications. Chapter 5 deals with ecclesiastical history under various heads, including the various monastic orders, and the annals of non-Catholic churches, Protestants, Jews, and others. Chapters 6 and 7 contain the constitutional history of

France—the history of the States-General, and the various political assemblies which succeeded each other so rapidly since 1789—together with the administrative system, classified under the heads of Justice, Army, Finance, &c. These are followed by four chapters on diplomatic and military history, manners and customs, and archæology, including numismatics and sphragistics. Provincial and local history, including that of the colonies, the history of classes, orders, families, and biography, occupy the last four chapters.

This sketch gives a very inadequate idea of the masterly system employed in this great work, a system of classification proceeding regularly from the general to the special, and carried out in very minute detail. None of the other bibliographies to which I shall call your attention is so minutely classified as the French catalogue, nor does any one of them come near it in the enormous number of works to which it refers; for it contains more than ten times as many entries as all the rest put together. It may be observed that the other bibliographies, while resembling this in many respects, depart from it in grouping the 'Hülfswissenschaften' (auxiliary sciences) near the beginning and not among the minor specialties, after the administrative system. These auxiliary sciences hold a place in the French catalogue inferior to that allotted to them in most modern bibliographies.

(2) The *Quellenkunde der deutschen Geschichte*, by Dahlmann and Waitz, is divided into two main parts, (I.) general works, (II.) original works and subsequent authorities ('Quellen und Hülfsmittel'), according to the sequence of events. Under the first head come (1) auxiliary sciences ('Hülfswissenschaften'), such as geography, linguistic, palæography, chronology, &c.; (2) sources ('Quellen') or original authorities, chronicles, collections of documents, codes of laws, treaties, even songs and proverbs; (3) bibliographies, collections of essays, journals; (4) general histories ('Bearbeitungen') of Germany at large or of its different States, biographical dictionaries and general histories of particular

departments, such as law and constitution, religion and Church, army, finance, education, art, literature, &c.

In the second part, which embraces nearly three-fourths of the volume, the items are arranged in books, eight in number, each containing one epoch, from pagan days to the accession of the present Emperor, William II. Each epoch is subdivided into smaller chronological sections, with separate sections (varying in the different epochs) for the history of the law, ecclesiastical affairs, literature, &c. ; but these sections appear to be somewhat capriciously distributed. The general arrangement is sufficiently clear and intelligible, but it does not appear to me so logical as that of the great French catalogue ; and the classification is not nearly so minute. The more important works are marked by asterisks, but there are no analyses of contents or estimates of value, no adequate notes of the best or latest editions, no cross references, and no page-headings. On the other hand there is an excellent index of over a hundred pages. The arrangement of books in the different classes is unintelligible to me ; it is neither alphabetical according to authors' names nor chronological according to dates of publication.

(3) Monod's *Bibliographie de l'Histoire de France* has for its subtitle 'A Methodical and Chronological Catalogue of the Sources and Works relative to the History of France from the Origins to 1789.' It is a pity that it does not come down to our own day, and it is much to be hoped that M. Monod or some one else will complete this valuable work.[1] M. Monod expresses, in his preface, the desire to do the same thing for French history down to 1789 as Dahlmann and Waitz had done for German ; and he has certainly succeeded. It is observable that he has followed the Dahlmann-Waitz arrangement very closely—so closely, indeed, as to make it unnecessary to describe it in detail. He has deliberately preferred the German lead to that of his own great official catalogue—a notable fact, that could hardly have occurred

[1] MM. Aulard and Seignobos promise a *Bibliographie de l'Histoire de France depuis* 1789, which has not yet appeared.

before 1870. Like its model it is divided into parts, the one called 'Recueils et Ouvrages Généraux,' the other 'Histoire par Époques.' In some minor respects M. Monod, in my opinion, improves on the German book, as in placing general bibliography and chronology at the very beginning; but he seems to be mistaken in including 'biography'—that is to say, biographical dictionaries—among 'Auxiliary Sciences.' The second part (epochal history) is divided into six epochs, with subsections, one section in each epoch dealing with 'Droit, Mœurs, et Institutions.' Why the subsection is confined to these subjects, and does not contain, for instance, religion or literature, I do not know.

M. Monod's book has page-headings, but suffers in other respects from the same defects as Dahlmann. Its index is considerably less full, being contained in forty pages; and the arrangement of items within the different classes is, so far as I can judge, as fortuitous as that of Dahlmann.

(4) Larned's *Literature of American History* is in one respect a more ambitious work than either of the two last mentioned, for it is not only a list but a guide, the mention of every work being followed by a brief description of its contents and an estimate of its value. These estimates sometimes cover half a page. It calls itself, in fact, 'a bibliographical guide, in which the scope, character, and comparative worth of books in selected lists are set forth in brief notes by critics of authority.' Forty-one contributors are mentioned by name on the title-page. The editor's preface says that the book 'is neither an exhaustive bibliography of American history nor merely a selection of the best books.' Its aim is 'to embrace the books of every character, good, bad, and indifferent, concerning which it seems important that readers of various classes should be told what their merit or demerit is.' Accordingly we are told, for instance, of one book that its 'ostentatious title marks a fraud.' The criticisms appear to be generally trustworthy and unbiassed, as when reference is made to Bancroft's 'exultant Americanism;' sometimes they show a certain want of judgment, as when Seeley's

'Expansion of England' is admitted to be 'readable, despite a certain indifference to style.' On the whole I do not think that the example of Mr. Larned's book is to be followed in regard to critical notes, if only for the reason that they unduly expand the size of the book.

The arrangement of the work is simple. A first general section is followed by sections descending, according to the geographical area covered, from the general to the particular —from histories and works dealing with America at large to histories of the United States as a whole, or of the different States that compose the Union. Canada and Spanish and Portuguese America are included. The items in each class are arranged alphabetically under authors' names. There are several appendices and an excellent index of 110 pages.

(5) Mr. Charles Gross's *Sources and Literature of English History* is in some respects more complete in plan and more detailed in its classification than any of its predecessors except the great French official catalogue. But, although he divides his work into five parts, his system really follows that of Dahlmann and Monod, his first part corresponding to their first or general part, while the other three correspond to the epochal divisions of their second part, with this notable difference, that in each epoch the distinction between original authorities and subsequent works is more clearly marked in Gross than in the other books.

As in Dahlmann and Monod, part i. occupies about a fourth part of the whole. It consists of five chapters, arranged as follows: (1) introductory—works on historical method, bibliographies, journals, and proceedings of societies; (2) auxiliaries ('Hülfswissenchaften')—philology, chronology, palæography, numismatics, &c.—eight sections in all; (3) the archives—contents of the Public Record Office, British Museum, &c.; (4) printed collections of sources; (5) modern writers, arranged according to the departments of which they treat—general treatises, Crown and Parliament, justice and police, army and navy, Church, local history, &c.—ten sections in all.

Parts ii.–iv. comprise works of a more or less specialised character bearing on particular epochs, or parts of epochs, part ii. dealing with Celtic, Roman, and Germanic origins, part iii. with the Anglo-Saxon period, and part iv. with the four centuries following the Norman Conquest. In each of these parts the original authorities are clearly marked off from later works. In parts iii. and iv. they are dealt with in separate chapters, divided into numerous sections and subsections, according to the nature of the documents, as chronicles, laws, charters; or according to the subject matter, as Parliament, Exchequer, foreign relations, &c. In other words, in the second or epochal division of Mr. Gross's work there are three classifications—(1) by periods of time; (2) by the date, contemporary or subsequent, of the work in question; (3) by the nature of the document or work, or by the subject of which it treats. These are kept in due subordination; and the work is systematic and readily intelligible throughout. The bibliography proper is followed by several appendices, giving a synopsis, *e.g.* of the Rolls Series, and the reports of the Historical Commission, and chronological tables of chronicles, &c. A full index concludes the work.

In the matter of arrangement and classification, then, Mr. Gross's book is at least equal to the two predecessors most comparable with it. In the detail of his classification and the fulness and clearness of his table of contents, and in such minor but important matters as page-headings and cross references, he is superior to them. But what puts him, in some degree, in a different class is that he appends to a very large proportion of his entries analyses of contents and estimates of value, terse, scholarly, and illuminating; while to each section he prefixes an introductory note of a very useful description. He also marks the most important works with asterisks. The chief, perhaps the only, fault I have to find with him is that the entries follow, within the sections, not a chronological but an alphabetical order.

After this long and, I fear, somewhat tedious analysis of

the chief books which may serve as models in the undertaking which I contemplate, we are, at all events, in a better position for considering the principles on which a 'Bibliography of British History since the close of the Middle Ages' should be based.

In the first place, then, while we cannot be too careful in selecting our materials with judgment, describing them with scrupulous accuracy, and classifying them according to a clear and logical system, our primary rule should be practical convenience—the convenience not of the beginner, or of the *Forscher* anxious to exhaust every possible source of information, but of the great mass of historical readers and students who come between those extremes. We shall not confine ourselves to the elements, but we shall not attempt to be exhaustive. As Mr. Harrison says, 'a bibliography, to be worthy of English scholarship, however complete, however exhaustive in its research, should be emphatically a select, systematic, and judicious assortment of authorities.' We shall endeavour to include all books which contain valuable information or fruitful ideas not to be found elsewhere, even text-books fit to be recommended to young students; and we shall prefer omitting bad books to inserting them (as Mr. Larned does) in order to point out that they are bad. But in our selection, from the point of view of quality, it is impossible to draw the line of choice with mathematical precision, or to say more than that we should include books good enough to be included, and no other.

But with respect to the different kinds of authorities that should be included we may—indeed, we must—arrive at a clearer understanding. First there is the distinction between MSS. and printed books. Here, I fear, I must differ from Mr. Harrison, who says plainly that the scheme which he contemplated 'would not include MSS.' The question is not quite so important as it would be if we were proposing to deal with the Middle Ages, which, since Mr. Harrison read his paper, have been adequately dealt with by Mr. Gross. But it is still very important, for vast masses of

documents—state papers of all kinds, rolls, writs, proclamations, commissions, letters in public and private collections, even memoirs and narratives by contemporaries—are still unprinted, and will probably in most cases remain unprinted for generations to come. The calendars of the Record Office, the labours of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, and the energy of private individuals have made and are still making large quantities of these MS. authorities more or less accessible. We cannot ignore them. To pass them by in silence would deprive our bibliography of a great part of its usefulness. We might, indeed, confine our attention to such MS. authorities as have been catalogued, calendared, or otherwise made known in print; and it may turn out to be practically impossible to go beyond this point; but so far, at all events, we can go and ought to go, and in particular cases we may go further. We must, at any rate, not exclude MS. authorities.

Next as to pamphlets, essays, magazine articles, speeches, lectures, proceedings, and transactions of societies and similar smaller productions. Pamphlets, it need hardly be said, are extremely numerous in the last four centuries of our history, and are often primary authorities of the greatest value. A history, for instance, of the Civil War and the Protectorate that ignored pamphlets would be a very inadequate history. Still it would be impossible to mention all or nearly all the pamphlets of importance; and all we could do, in most cases, would be to refer the student to the lists of such collections as Thomason's or to catalogues like that of the British Museum. As to articles in reviews or learned periodicals, these again are legion. They are often, perhaps in most cases, worthless, but not unfrequently they contain facts, ideas, or hints not to be found elsewhere. Indeed, it was mainly for the purpose of making the student acquainted with such literature that the great International Scientific Catalogue, to which I have already referred, was set on foot. As Mr. Tedder says, our bibliography should contain not only books, but also pamphlets, pieces in collections, articles

in periodicals, and transactions of learned societies. To make a proper selection among writings of this sort will require great labour and acute discrimination, but ignore them we cannot.

Biographies and autobiographies, personal narratives and memoirs, voyages and travels, descriptions of a particular place or country must also be included. We must not omit such books as Cook's 'Voyages,' Young's 'Tours,' or Cobbett's 'Rural Rides.'

A more difficult question arises with respect to historical novels, tales, and stage plays. The objections to including them are obvious. Nevertheless they sometimes contain historical traditions not preserved elsewhere, or they represent a certain way of regarding historical facts which is itself of historical importance. Still more important to the student of social history are the works of the great dramatists and novelists, which throw a vivid light on contemporary manners and ideas. Who would venture to write an historical treatise on society under the Restoration without knowing Wycherley, on that of the early Hanoverians without having read Fielding, or the Victorian age without the aid of Trollope and Thackeray? I do not venture to decide this question; I only plead for its serious consideration.

It need hardly be said that foreign writers on British history, foreign lives of British statesmen, foreign books on our foreign policy, constitution, &c., must be included whenever they are worthy of inclusion, whether they are translated or not. The works of Ranke, Guizot, Gneist, Liebermann, and Vinogradoff will be prominent in our list; and such books as Montesquieu's 'Esprit des Lois' or Voltaire's 'Lettres sur l'Angleterre,' even though their views may in some respects be erroneous, are far too important historical documents to be omitted.

So much, then, for the classes of books to be included. Next as to the period of time and the geographical area to be covered. Mr. Gross has covered the ground down to the

end of the Middle Ages with such fulness and accuracy that, so far as the earlier period of our history is concerned, we have only to rest and be thankful that the work is done, and done so well. This fact, however, only makes it more incumbent on us that we should take up the work where he leaves off, and endeavour to produce a bibliography of our subsequent history worthy to stand alongside his. We shall begin, then, with the accession of Henry VII. in 1485. But where are we to end? Dahlmann's book comes down to 1888; Monod's stops at 1789; Larned's comes down to the present day; Mullinger's 'Introduction' stops, I hardly know why, at 1822. It appears to me in every way desirable to bring our work down as near as possible to our own day. Yesterday is already history, though it may be too near to judge. We have no great break in our history like 1789 in that of France. We cannot stop between 1837 and 1901. Let us, then, end with the end of the reign of Queen Victoria.

As to the geographical area to be covered, the irreducible minimum is England and Wales—for I cannot consent to letting off Wales in any case. But would it tend to sound historical scholarship or to bibliographical completeness if we omitted Scotland and Ireland? We *must* include Scotland after 1707 and Ireland after 1800; and during the whole of our period they are so closely mixed up with England in all sorts of ways that we cannot omit them from our bibliography. The United Kingdom, both before and after it was united, must be our theme; and we can rely on the Scottish and Irish historians to help us in our task. Mr. Harrison says: 'The scheme should be limited to English history;' but from the context it appears that he is only anxious that it should not attempt to include European history. As he is not a Scotsman I will assume that by English he means British, and he would probably allow us to include Ireland in that term.

But are we to confine our attention to these little islands in a foggy northern sea, and to omit the history of the

territories, the colonies and dependencies which make our chief title to greatness? I hope not. Ours must be a truly national bibliography, and in this I am glad to find that Mr. Tedder agrees with me. We must include the American colonies down to 1776, before they became the United States, India since Elizabeth's charter to the East India Company in 1600, Canada at least since 1763, South Africa since 1795, Australia and all the other colonies since the beginning of our occupation—in some cases since their discovery. To do this will be a heavy task, but it must be faced.

Next, as to the departments of national history to be embraced. There will be no hesitation, of course, as to those departments of our national life which we may label as political, constitutional, ecclesiastical, economical, legal; or as to military and naval history, foreign policy, local and municipal government, justice and police. All these belong to the State at large—some, no doubt, in greater, some in less proportions—and touch all citizens alike. Education is on the border line, but should be included as fast becoming more and more a State concern. The difficulty comes when we touch such subjects as literature and philosophy, science and scholarship, art and architecture. We might, no doubt, leave them out; but I confess that, to parody a hackneyed line, 'Historicus sum, nihil historici a me alienum puto.' We have no concern, as historians, with the eternal principles or the philosophy of these subjects, but with their historical aspects we are concerned, at least so far as they have had an influence on the progress of the State. To put an extreme case, we cannot appreciate the spirit of Elizabeth's day without knowing the works of Shakespeare and Bacon, or shall we say Bacon-cum-Shakespeare? Newton's theory of gravitation may not have directly influenced the policy of Harley or Walpole, but science cannot be dissevered from 'the railway and the steamship and the thoughts that move mankind.' Adam Smith, Ricardo, and Mill—we must know something of these philosophers if we are to understand our commercial development between 1750 and 1850. The

general advance of science and the scientific spirit has insensibly modified our attitude towards religion and the Church, and consequently one of the greatest of historico-political questions, the relation of Church and State. As to art and architecture, they may seem apart, but do not the buildings of Inigo Jones and Christopher Wren, the paintings of Vandyke and Lely, of Holbein and Reynolds, throw countless subtle lights on the character of their times? No, we cannot altogether omit these things; we must include some account of them, so far at least as the history of their development is concerned.

Of another class of subjects, which German historians call 'Hülfswissenschaften' (auxiliary sciences), I need hardly speak. I refer to the subjects of philology or linguistic, palæography and diplomatics, genealogy, geography and topography, numismatics, archæology (including heraldry and sphragistics), and others. The best books on these subjects are included in every historical bibliography worthy of the name.

One more point connected with this question of contents remains to be settled. Mr. Tedder is of opinion that the bibliography should include only works relating to national or general, as opposed to local or special, history. Here, I regret to say, I cannot agree with him. Are we to include only histories of Great Britain, and not histories of Ireland, or of India or Canada? Are we to insert Camden's 'Britannia' but to omit Stow's 'Survey of London,' or include Erskine May's 'Constitutional History' and leave out Thomas May's 'History of the Long Parliament'? We cannot ignore biographies or family histories, which are certainly special works, nor can we neglect county histories, or the annals of towns, or even those of great houses, for they frequently contain facts of great general importance; and the late Bishop of London has even remarked that the history of England has yet to be written from our local annals.

I come now to the thorny question of arrangement,

perhaps the most difficult and certainly not the least important question with which we are concerned.

First of all we shall put, as is usual, books bearing on what we call the auxiliary sciences—bibliographies, dictionaries, chronologies and calendars, maps, geographies and gazetteers, books on armorial bearings, seals, coins, and so forth, including guides to the Record Office or other places where documents and authorities are preserved, and all the other formidable paraphernalia which are supposed to form the equipment of a trained historian, or which the enquirer may be obliged to refer to in the course of his studies. To these should be added some general account of government publications, collections, publications of societies, &c., to be mentioned again in detail in their proper places. These books fall pretty easily into groups, and their arrangement, though admitting of variation in detail, does not raise any very difficult questions. When we come to books of history proper we get into more complicated ground. Our primary rule should certainly be to proceed from the general to the special. That is easy enough to say, but not so easy to apply; for a book may be general or special in different ways. A book may be regarded and classified from three points of view—(*a*) the length of time covered by it, (*b*) the extent of ground embraced in its view, (*c*) the subject with which it deals. To take some concrete instances, Hume's 'History of England' is undoubtedly a general work. It takes in the whole of English history from beginning to end. But is Macaulay's History, which includes three reigns only, a general work? Macaulay is general with respect to space, special with respect to time. Again, 'Hallam's Constitutional History' and Cunningham's 'History of British Industry' are general in point of time, special in point of subject. The 'Dictionary of National Biography' is general in one way, very special in another. And which is the most general or the most special, a history of London from its origin till now or a history of England in the reign of Anne, a history of Parliament from its beginning or a history of the Constitution under the

Tudors? The matter is evidently not so easy to settle as it looks.

Books, then, being general or special in at least three ways, according to our point of view, it remains for us to take one point of view and stick to it throughout. It does not much matter which we take so long as we are consistent. Consistency in general may or may not be a virtue, but in a bibliography it conduces to clearness, and therefore to utility. Time naturally seems the dominant element in an historical work; and most historical bibliographies adopt it as the primary determinant in classification. We may safely follow their example.

In the first group, then, we shall place books which are general in time, space, and subject—that is to say, histories of the world or of Europe, provided that they deal more or less with Great Britain. Next would come general histories of the British Empire; but I fear this space will have to be left blank. In the third group would come works general in time, but limited in space, as general histories of England or Scotland, of India or Australia, &c., including county histories and other local annals, provided they are general in time; finally those that are limited in subject-matter, such as general histories of the Constitution, of commerce and trade, of the Church, and so forth; such books being subdivided again according as they deal, *e.g.*, with commercial development in general or that of Great Britain, or that of England or Scotland, or some other part of the Empire in particular.

When we have exhausted and classified all these general works we should come to such as are special in point of time. Here we must first determine what chronological divisions to adopt, and secondly whether these divisions should apply to all parts of the British Empire alike. Whatever divisions we adopt, we must, I think, adopt them throughout. No doubt this is open to some objections. The year 1485 is not an important date in the history of Scotland, nor 1707 in that of England, nor 1800 in that of either Scotland or England.

But any other course would involve still greater difficulties; and it is perhaps not unfair that the predominant partner should decide.

If this be granted, we should naturally adopt, as our main chronological divisions, (1) the Tudor period; (2) the Stewart period down to the Revolution of 1688, or—which would be better—down to the death of the last Stewart sovereign in 1714; (3) the Hanoverian period to 1820, or perhaps to 1832; (4) the Reform or post-Reform age, to 1901. Within these periods we should be at liberty to make subdivisions such as the Reformation, the reign of Elizabeth, the Protectorate, the Civil Wars, &c.; or we might adopt the principle of the great French catalogue and subdivide according to reigns, but this would hardly satisfy modern historical feeling.

Again, within each period we should put first such books, or such parts of larger books, as deal with the period as a whole; then those that deal generally with portions of it, as, *e.g.*, the reign of Elizabeth; next those dealing with portions of the Empire within a particular period, as with 'Ireland under the Tudors;' afterwards those that deal with particular departments within the period, *e.g.* histories of the Anglican settlement under Elizabeth, or with the army of Cromwell; finally biographies of distinguished persons, with collections of their letters, or their important works, so far as they fall within the period.

Works should be cited under their authors' names, unless they are anonymous, in which case the pen-name, if any, *e.g.* Junius, or if there is none, then the most important word in the title, or the subject, might be taken. The titles should be given in full, unless very voluminous; and the subtitles also in cases where they indicate clearly the contents of the book. In arranging the items within any group they should follow a chronological, not an alphabetical order. A full index renders the alphabetical order superfluous; and the chronological order has great advantages. It should be determined by the date of writing if a MS., or of the first

edition if a printed book. The last edition, if there are more editions than one, should be mentioned; also the best, if there is a best; and such editions as are annotated. Such information may be of the greatest use. If the chronological order is adopted, the division of authorities into contemporary and modern, or primary and secondary—often difficult to carry out in practice—becomes superfluous.

Such, as it appears to me, are the main principles on which our bibliography should be based. There remain many details which will have to be settled before we can set to work. Even if I have not already overtaxed your patience, this is hardly the place to enlarge upon such matters. I will indicate only two or three which are perhaps of special importance.

To all items in our catalogue the size, roughly designated as 8vo, 4to, &c., and the number of volumes, should be added, together with the place and date of the original publication. When considerable changes have been made in subsequent editions, the same particulars should be added for the last, or the best, edition.

Each item should be numbered, for convenience of reference and cross-reference; but the numbering should not be continuous. In order that subsequently published works may be added without deranging the numeration throughout, blanks should be left at the end of each class, the next class beginning with a fresh hundred, or thousand, as the case may be, according to the plan followed in the numbering of the houses in American streets.

It is certainly desirable that analyses of contents, as short as possible, should be given, at least in the cases of the more important works. Estimates of their value may perhaps be added; but this practice is open to objection, and may involve error. I would at all events deprecate the attempt to signalise the best books by asterisks or other devices, since no two critics are likely to draw the line between marked and

unmarked books at precisely the same spot. Some indication should be given of the places where rare books are to be found.

An exhaustive index, an adjunct of the greatest utility, the details of which will have to be carefully considered, should complete the work.

It is extremely difficult to calculate in advance the size to which a bibliography such as I contemplate will run. Mr. Tedder has estimated that it may be contained in two thick octavo volumes ; and, as Mr. Tedder is far more competent than I am to make such an estimate, I willingly adopt his opinion. As to the expense, I forbear from making any calculation. It will undoubtedly be a costly undertaking ; but, considering that, once accomplished, it will be of permanent utility, and will be capable of being kept up to date by constant additions, I have little doubt that, if a sufficient staff of competent scholars can unite for this common purpose, they will readily find a publisher.

Here I have touched on the one indispensable condition of success. I have sketched out a large plan—one that is beyond the reach of any single man, one that will require the active and generous co-operation of many scholars, working in groups under competent and harmonious direction. I trust that such co-operation is not beyond our power to attain. I do not suggest that this society, in its corporate capacity, should undertake the task. It is outside its province, and far out of reach of its pecuniary resources. But within the ranks of our society we have the men who could accomplish it, if they would ; and there is much to encourage us in the belief that such co-operation is practicable and would succeed. I would remind you of the great co-operative works which have recently been completed, or are in process of completion—the 'Dictionary of National Biography,' the huge Encyclopædias, the Universal Histories, such as those of MM. Lavisse and Rambaud and Dr. Helmolt and the 'Cambridge Modern History,' the serial publications of all kinds.

Surely it is not too much to hope that co-operation of this sort would be equal to the production of an "Historical Bibliography" which would satisfactorily fill an acknowledged gap, and remove what is at present both a reproach and a hindrance to British historical scholarship.

TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

THE ENGLISH PREMONSTRATENSIANS

By THE RIGHT REV. F. A. GASQUET, D.D.

Read December 19th, 1902

THE Premonstratensian Order was founded in the early part of the twelfth century by St. Norbert. This remarkable man was born at Xanten, in the duchy of Cleves, in 1080. His family were highly connected, his father being Count of Gennep, and his mother a cousin of the Emperor Henry IV The aspirations of Norbert's early years seemed to mark him out for an ecclesiastical career, and as quite a youth, in accordance with an abuse of Church patronage unfortunately too common in those days, he was presented with a canonry in his native city. At the earliest possible age he was ordained subdeacon ; but, being attracted by natural disposition to the gaieties of the world, for a long time he hesitated to enter the higher grades of the sacred ministry and passed his time mostly at the court of his cousin the Emperor, to whom he acted as almoner. In the thirtieth year of his age, however, his thoughts were turned to the more serious side of life by a narrow escape from death by lightning. After a prolonged preparation he received the sacred orders of

deacon and priest, and spent a considerable period of strict retirement in the abbey of Conon. As a result of his reflections he resigned his canonry and other preferments, and in 1118 embraced a life of complete poverty in order that he might the better devote his life to the work of preaching to the poor. He commenced his new mode of work by an unsuccessful attempt to induce his brethren, the canons of Xanten, to embrace a life more in accord with the regular observances, to which they were bound, at least theoretically, by their name of 'canons.' Failing to induce others to follow his example, in 1119 he determined to establish a body of regular canons constituted according to his ideals. For the purpose of his first experiment Norbert made choice of a lonely and desolate valley in the forest of St. Gobain, which subsequently became renowned throughout Europe as Prémontré. Here, by the side of a stream and near to the remains of an ancient chapel, the Bishop of Laon built for him and his companions the first house of the new Order, and here on Christmas Day 1121 some forty religious received the white habit and cloak of canons regular. Their founder gave them the rule of St. Augustine, and four years later, in 1125, the Premonstratensian Canons were formally approved by Pope Honorius I.

From the time of its first foundation the new Order grew by leaps and bounds. St. Norbert, as I have said, destined his followers for the preaching of the Gospel to the poor; but they were to be moulded for their work by the practice of strict conventual life. He gave them the rule of the Austin Canons, and desired that the superior should receive the Abbatial dignity and character. It is worth remarking that the Prémontré Canons were the first to conceive the idea, afterwards so largely developed by the mendicants of the thirteenth century, of uniting to them by a formal aggregation laymen and women in what was known as a 'third Order.' These associated brethren, though not bound by the stricter obligations of religious life, still while engaged in their secular employments followed a mitigated observance

somewhat akin to that of the canons themselves. At Prémontré and elsewhere there were also established in the vicinity of the abbeys convents of women, called canonesses, much on the lines subsequently adopted by the Gilbertines in England. This form of Premonstratensian life, however, never obtained in this country, and the only two establishments of English canonesses which came into existence had no connection with any abbey of the Order.

The first monastery of Premonstratensian Canons in these islands was in Scotland, whither King David brought a colony in 1125 ; that is, of course, during the lifetime of the founder. In England itself the first abbey was set up at Newhouse in Lincolnshire, to which in 1143 the abbey of Licques, near Calais, furnished the community. Within a quarter of a century Newhouse became the parent of Alnwick (1147), St. Agatha's (1152) ; Welbeck (1153) ; Barlings (1154) ; and Sulby or Welford (1154). In another fifty years or so, it had sent out six more colonies : namely, Croxton (1172) ; Tupholme (1190) ; Neubo (1198) ; Dale, otherwise called Stanley Park (1204) ; and Coverham (1212). In 1195 Alnwick placed a daughter house at Langley, and in 1200 St. Agatha's one at Eggleston. In almost the same period Welbeck, destined to be perhaps the most important of all the English houses, had planted seven colonies : Hagneby (1175) ; Leyston (1183) ; Beauchief (1183) ; West Dereham (1188) ; Torre (1196) ; Dureford (*circa* 1217) ; and Hales Owen (1218). Sulby, too, had established one daughter abbey at Lavendon ; and Croxton three, namely Blanchland (1190), Cockersand (1193), and Horneby (? 1200) ; whilst Shap or Heppa, in Cumberland, was the creation of Blanchland within a few years of its own foundation. Prémontré itself was directly responsible for the foundation of two English houses : St. Radegund's, or Bradsole abbey (1193), and Begeham (1200). To these we must add Langdon, an offshoot from Leyston (1183) ; Titchfield, founded in 1231 ; Wendling, founded from Langley (1267) ; Bileigh near Maldon (1180) ; and the cell of Dodford, founded from Hales Owen. To complete the list of Premonstraten-

sian foundations in England it is necessary to name the two convents of canonesses of the Order at Brodholm in Nottinghamshire and Irford in Lincoln.

Down to the present time the information available for the general history of the Order in this country, and for the particular history of the above-named thirty-four houses, has been scanty and disappointing. The collection of documents which the Royal Historical Society now proposes to print in the series of Camden publications adds very materially in every way to our knowledge of the general government of the Order in this country, and furnishes us with many documents of importance and interest for the history of each individual house. The papers are drawn from two sources: (1) A transcript of a Register of the Order, made in the eighteenth century, and now in the British Museum; and (2) an original Register among the Ashmole MSS. (MS. 1519) in the Bodleian Library.

The Museum transcript forms part of the collection of the antiquary Francis Peck, the author of the well-known *Desiderata Curiosa*, made with the intention of producing an additional volume to Dugdale's *Monasticon Anglicanum*. Five volumes (Add. MS. 4934 to Add. MS. 4938) among the Additional MSS. in the British Museum now contain these collections, and the first two relate exclusively to the Premonstratensian Canons. To a great extent the documents were transcribed, apparently about the year 1733, from a *Registrum Premonstratense*; and although, to suit the convenience of students, Peck has systematised and arranged this Register, he is careful to give the foliation of the original MS., and it is thus possible to say that he has made use of the entire Register. The Museum became possessed of these Peck transcripts in a very simple manner. Upon the death of the antiquary most of his manuscripts were purchased by Sir Thomas Cave. These monastic collections were placed by him in the hands of Dr. Andrew Gifford, one of the sub-librarians of the British Museum, for examination and arrangement. At the beginning of the first of these five volumes

(MS. 4934) Dr. Gifford has inserted a memorandum, dated May 14, 1779, setting forth how they found their way into the national library. Having put them in order for Sir Thomas Cave, Dr. Gifford, recognising their value for English monastic history, pressed Sir Thomas to allow them to remain among the Museum collections. He could obtain no definite promise from their owner, and had to be content with a reply to the effect that 'probably some time or other they would come' to the library. For many years they remained under Dr. Gifford's care at the Museum; but in the year 1777 the owner called for them and took them away. Sir Thomas died the year after their removal, and his son, in answer to Dr. Gifford's renewed request that these collections might be given to the Museum, handed them over to him. The opinion of the librarian as to their worth is recorded in the note already mentioned. 'They are,' he says, 'a most valuable and almost inestimable collection. If the gentlemen at Rome, who have been some years composing the history of the Premonstratenses, knew of them, doubtless they would consult and insert them; having made great enquiries after the same years ago.'

Unfortunately, Peck does not give any indication of the place where the Register thus transcribed was preserved. This is all the more strange inasmuch as in his other collections he is usually most careful to give the name of the owner of every manuscript he copied. Thus a great many papers were to be found, we are told, in the Duke of Rutland's room at Belvoir Castle: as, for example, the Domesday of Croxton Abbey. But, in the case of the *Registrum Premonstratense*, though in every case the folio of the MS. is carefully noted, no indication is given by which it is possible to discover even where the original was in Peck's time, still less of course where it is at the present day. As no reference whatever is made by the antiquary to ownership, it seems not improbable that the volume may have been his own property at the time he copied it.

The second source from which it is proposed to take the

collections for Premonstratensian history, about to be published by this Society, is, as I have already indicated, a volume now in the Bodleian Library. MS. Ashmole 1519 is an original Register of Bishop Redman, and records his visitations and other business transactions with the Premonstratensian Order in England, of which he was a member, and, during a long period at the end of the fifteenth century, practically the superior. It had been supposed by many that this Ashmole MS. was really the original *Registrum Premonstratense* from which Peck's transcript had been made. This, however, proved not to be the case when, by means of the transcript of the Oxford MS. acquired by the Royal Historical Society, it has been possible to compare it carefully with Peck's transcript. They are, indeed, entirely different ; but there can be little doubt that the *Registrum Premonstratense* used by Peck originally formed part of the same general Register of which the Ashmole MS. is the other part.

In the first, or Peck MS., the earliest document is a letter dated 1291, and written by the Abbot of Prémontré to England. The entire volume comprises some 165 distinct records, the last being the account of the election of Edmund Greyne as abbot of Hales Owen, on July 4, 1505. Most of the documents are concerned with the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and towards the close of the latter century there are recorded many visitations made by Bishop Redman. The second, or Ashmole MS., is rightly known, however, as 'Redman's Register,' since, whilst registering indeed some few early papers—probably copied into the volume for easy reference, as precedents—the volume is almost entirely filled with the record of Bishop Redman's administration of the Order from 1474 to 1505. The visitations registered in the other volume, it may be remarked, are supplementary to those here recorded.

Bishop Redman, a native of Cumberland, entered the Premonstratensian Order in the house of Shap, of which he subsequently became abbot, some time about 1459. Shap Abbey was situated only a few miles from Levens, his birth-

place, and it was an important house with ample revenues. In 1478 Redman was nominated by the Abbot of Prémontré his vicar in England. By this time he had already been Bishop of St. Asaph for ten years, although he still continued to hold the abbacy of Shap with full jurisdiction, spending much of his time in the practical government of his house. Redman was evidently a man of great energy and determination. He found the cathedral church of his see of St. Asaph a mere heap of ruins, in which state it had remained since Owen Glendower had destroyed it in 1408. He set to work to restore it, and when, in 1496, he was translated to Exeter, he left it substantially what it remains to-day. In 1501 he was again translated, to Ely, and he died at Ely House, Holborn, on August 24, 1505. Practically during all his long episcopate, extending over thirty-seven years, Redman continued to exercise the office of visitor of his Order in England, and the record of his work is to be found in the two volumes of his Register about to be published by the Royal Historical Society. That he continued to hold the abbacy of Shap after he became bishop, and that not merely *in commendam* but as the governing superior, is a fact quite out of the ordinary course and somewhat difficult to explain. The only suggestion I can offer is that, in view of the impoverished state of his first diocese and of his determination to rebuild his cathedral, he was allowed to retain the well-endowed abbey of Shap. His continuance to the close of his life in the office of Visitor of the English Province of Premonstratensian Canons is evidence that he was appreciated by his brethren, and had the full confidence of the heads of the Order abroad.

Peck's transcript of the *Registrum Premonstratense*, then, and the Ashmole original MS., when put together, form one general Register, and they furnish a fairly full record of the Order in England during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Moreover, it would appear more than likely that both volumes were in reality the work of Bishop Redman. Both certainly were connected with him in some way or other, since the records of his visitations are to be found in both, although

no single record is repeated: the full Register requiring both manuscripts to complete it. It would seem probable that in the first part, which we know only in Peck's transcript, the Bishop had gathered together copies of early documents, mainly regarding the relations of the mother house at Prémontré with the English abbeys; these, with certain forms likely to be useful in the work of administration either for reference as precedents, or to be copied as occasion required, form the greater portion of the volume, the rest being taken up with records of actual visitations. The Ashmole MS. is almost exclusively occupied with the acts of the Bishop's administration as vicar of the Abbot of Prémontré and as visitor.

Of the subsequent history of this latter volume practically very little is known. In 1697, when the *Catalogus Angliæ* was published, it was already among the Ashmole MSS. In 1642, however, Gervase Holles transcribed from it certain lists in a volume now in the British Museum (Add. MS. 6118), and the old Register was then in the possession of Sir Wingfield Bodenham. This is practically all that is known about it. Since it has been in the Bodleian it has furnished some material to local antiquaries interested in the history of certain houses, but not to any great extent. In Nash's *Worcestershire* (Appendix, xxxix–xl) there are several pieces regarding Hales Owen printed from the volume. Addy, in the *History of Beauchief*, gives his translation of some few documents.

One feature of Peck's transcript must be noticed. I have said that the antiquary did more than merely copy the original Register: he arranged it in such a way as to render its contents more accessible to the historical inquirer. In the first instance he sorted the documents and classified them under the heads of *Generalia* and *Specialia*. In the first division he placed all records relating to the general history or administration of the Order in England, arranged as far as possible in strict chronological sequence. In the second or *Specialia* he gathered up all pieces relating to the indi-

vidual houses and arranged them under their special names set down in alphabetical order. In this way those who were interested in any special locality or abbey are able to turn at once to the material they desire to consult. On consideration and consultation for the purpose of the forthcoming edition of the MSS., Peck's arrangement was thought to be so useful that not only has it been determined not to disturb it, but to treat the Ashmole Register upon the same system, and to classify the documents contained in it under the same two headings, placing them in their proper position with those copied by Peck.

Let us now consider a few of the main features in the history of the English Premonstratensians as it appears in the documents thus arranged. The first, and indeed in many ways the most important, point illustrated by these papers are the relations of the English abbeys with the head house of the Order at Prémontré. Although, as we have seen, that abbey had very little direct share in planting the English branch of Premonstratensians, it still claimed, by the rule of St. Norbert, to be something more than a head or chief house. Its abbot demanded the right to exercise authority over all houses of the Order and to occupy the position of general superior over all other abbots. In this the claims of Prémontré were similar to those of Cîteaux and Cluny in regard to the Benedictine houses of their respective Congregations.

The case of the English Premonstratensians provides us with a good illustration of the almost necessary difficulties and inconveniences which in practice existed in regard to these international Congregations, and of the friction which, at times at least, prevented the smooth working of such a system. Apart from the obvious difficulty, which must be experienced by any foreign superior, of understanding the temperament and peculiar needs of his English subjects, national complications were always possible, and the religious in this country were frequently forced to make choice between obedience to the laws of their country and the duty they owed to the foreign heads of their Order.

From the English canons Prémontré claimed three things: regular attendance on the part of the abbots at the annual General Chapter, held at the mother house; the appointment of the visitor to examine and report to the Abbot General as to the state of the houses; and the right to tax the affiliated houses for the benefit of the Order in general and Prémontré in particular. It was this last demand which, in practice, caused many difficulties and led to many misunderstandings. Our documents, indeed, commence with a very pretty quarrel on this score in full swing. Adam de Crecy was Abbot of Prémontré from 1304 to 1327, and the result of his battle royal with the English suffragan abbots on the subject of subsidies was ever after considered as the ruling precedent, at least in this country. The English abbots, acting on a royal prohibition against any such payments to foreign superiors—which, by the way, they do not seem to have much misliked—had been for some time defaulters, when, in 1310, Abbot Adam de Crecy summoned them all to the meeting of General Chapter at Prémontré, and commanded them to bring with them the overdue tallages. On receipt of this citation the abbots met together on July 23, 1310, and by a joint letter, whilst expressing 'due obedience, reverence, and honour' for the Abbot of Prémontré personally, informed him that they were quite unable to comply with his orders. A royal prohibition passed by Parliament, they said, prevented them from leaving the kingdom for such a purpose, and were they to disregard this statute they would certainly be outlawed and unable to return to their country. Two of their number were, however, deputed to go over the sea to the meeting of General Chapter, and they were charged to explain more fully the real state of the case, and that, besides this prohibition against leaving the country, the English law also forbade them to pay any tax that might be imposed upon them by the Order abroad.

The abbots of Langdon and Sulby were the two chosen as proctors to represent their English brethren at Prémontré on

this occasion, and, fortified by a letter signed and sealed by fourteen English abbots, they attended the meeting of Chapter. How they fared does not exactly appear in these papers except in the result. Abbot Adam and the Chapter of Prémontré would listen to no explanation, and they issued a decree of condemnation against the English abbots for not appearing in answer to the citation, and for not paying the required subsidy. Their excuses, as set forth by the two delegates, were rejected as unworthy and inadequate; and a sentence of excommunication was passed on all of them, to take effect without further formality if they had not paid all that was due from them by the following Easter. Their delegates, the abbots of Langdon and Sulby, were ordered moreover under severe penalties to publish this sentence of the whole Order in every English abbey before the end of the year.

On October 18, 1310, consequently, these two abbots summoned a General Chapter of the English Province to meet them at Lincoln on December 1, in the church of the Friars of the Sack (Saccorum). Besides the attendance of the abbot, each house was, as usual, directed to elect and send a delegate to the meeting, that the affair might be fully known and discussed. The delegates would, they say, personally explain to the Fathers how and for what reasons the Chapter at Prémontré had rejected the excuses, they had been charged to give in their name, for not obeying the citation to Chapter and for their continued non payment of the tallages. In the same assembly they purposed to carry out the orders they had received in regard to the publication of the decree of general excommunication. The position was difficult and perplexing; on the one side and on the other there was danger. If the English abbots gave way and paid the foreign demands, they would have to reckon with the law of the land; if they refused or neglected to comply, they were threatened with the displeasure of their superior and the heaviest spiritual penalties. It was really a case of 'the devil and the deep sea;' but it is fortunately not necessary, at any rate for us, to determine exactly which was which.

The English abbots, as we have seen, were to meet at Lincoln on December 1, 1310; but before that date the King had written a letter to the conveners of the Chapter, which somewhat assisted the solution or at least fortified the English abbots in their resolution to resist. It is not very far-fetched to imagine that some one of the Fathers had acquainted the King with the perilous position in which they found themselves. At any rate, on November 10, 1310, Edward II., writing from Berwick-on-Tweed, issued letters absolutely prohibiting the levying of any subsidy or tallage on behalf of Prémontré or the payment thereof. His father, Edward I., he says, had already finally dealt with this matter. Knowing that imposts were exacted of religious in England by their foreign superiors, contrary to the intention of the founders of the English houses and to the injury of the realm, in the thirtieth year of his reign he passed an act of Parliament forbidding any English superior ever again to try to raise such subsidies, under whatever name they chose to call them. By the present letter, therefore, the King desired to remind the abbots of Langdon and Sulby of these enactments, and warned them of the grave penalties they would all suffer if they ignored the statutes of the kingdom.

The King's monition had its due weight. The Chapter met as arranged at Lincoln, and the Fathers, sheltering themselves behind the authority of the royal letter, determined on a bold course of action. They denied that the Abbot of Prémontré or the Chapter could legally claim any tallage from them. They admitted that it had been paid previously, but they claimed that this had been done merely through motives of fraternal charity towards Prémontré, and not because they were in any way bound to contribute to the foreign establishment. In the present case, being constrained by King Edward's distinct prohibition, they unanimously resolved to withstand the claims of Abbot Adam and the General Chapter of the Order as onerous and injurious. They indited a spirited protest against the action of Prémontré, inasmuch as, although the distinct prohibition of

the King was made known to him, the Abbot had imposed heavy subsidies under ecclesiastical excommunication for refusal to pay. 'We therefore,' they say in conclusion, 'fearing prejudice to our houses, and desiring to safeguard their interests from foreign exactions and ourselves from excommunication and punishment, appeal directly to the Holy Apostolic See' for protection. Before dispersing, on December 2, 1310, the necessary formalities for the appeal were gone through in the choir of the Friars' Church, and notaries and proctors were appointed to draw up the needful documents and prosecute the business to a conclusion before the Curia.

For the purpose of the appeal, the proctors of the English abbots in the first instance called for copies of all the letters from Prémontré, which had been produced by the two abbots of Langdon and Sulby who had acted as delegates from the Abbot and General Chapter. These were produced on January 20, 1310–11 at Barlings Abbey, in a certain room called the 'abbot's new chamber.' The record of this meeting is of interest as showing the extreme care that was taken to verify the original documents : a minute description of the subscriptions and of various seals being recorded. The following day, January 21, in the abbot's said chamber and in the presence of a notary public, the English abbots constituted William de Kyrkton, canon of Barlings, Robert de Spalding, canon of Croxton, and Robert de Rotheram, canon of Beauchief, their proctors to prosecute the appeal to the Pope. They gave them full power to act and to get others to act in their name. They engaged to abide by the decision, whatever it might be, and pledged themselves to meet all necessary expenses.

The same day William de Kyrkton, named above as first proctor, submitted a draft of his formal appeal. It complained generally of the imposition of subsidies from abroad without the consent of the abbots themselves. It asserted in plain language that the English houses were unduly burdened and had a right to complain that such subsidies were

demanded under threat of spiritual censures. Moreover in regard to visitations the English canons had serious cause to protest. Whilst other provinces were visited yearly by two abbots chosen for the purpose in the district, the Abbot of Prémontré, either himself personally or by a commissary, had been accustomed to come over to England with a large train of horses and attendants, and this had been necessarily a source of great expense to the various houses. William de Kyrkton submitted this draft for the criticism and reply of the abbot of Langdon, who by a legal fiction was supposed to be representing the Abbot of Prémontré, and he annexed to it a list of papers. On March 10, 1311, the appeal was ratified by all the abbots who had not previously taken part in the business, and the process was launched at the Curia. As time went on, however, some of the order were apparently not so entirely satisfied as to the position of hostility to Prémontré definitely assumed by English abbots generally. How far the distrust went it is now impossible to say ; but a private letter was certainly sent by the abbots of Newhouse and Croxton to the other abbots of the midland houses requesting them to convoke a meeting as secretly as possible to discuss the matter. On August 22, also, the same two abbots, who were, by the way, the visitors of the Province in the year 1311, wrote fully to the same midland abbots explaining the situation and advising a continuance of the appeal. The English Premonstratensians were in a serious dilemma. Hence the only apparent and legitimate way out of it was to ask the Holy See to decide, and in this all agreed and guaranteed the necessary funds. They had acquainted the Abbot of Prémontré of their attitude and of their appeal. Some of the abbots, however, had not paid the sum at which they were taxed for expenses of the appeal, or rather had not refunded promptly to the writers, who had advanced the money for transmission to Rome, so as not to jeopardise their case by delay in the payment of fees. For this reason, as the visitors explain, it was necessary to make a

new apportionment, and all are asked to meet their obligations punctually and without fail. It is added, by way of encouraging them to pay cheerfully, that the subsidy demanded by Prémontré was really greater than the tax necessitated by the expenses of the appeal. The sum asked was in most cases 4*l.* 14*s.* from each house ; but the costs were mounting up, and already, in the one year, five demands had been made upon the abbeys, and the total had reached no less a sum than 320*l.*, a very considerable amount in those days.

Meanwhile, as far as appears, the Prémontré authorities abroad took no notice of the appeal to the Pope. General Chapter met in the autumn of 1311 and proceeded to declare the English abbots contumacious and rebellious in withholding the payments previously made to the head house and sanctioned by Chapter. These dues, however, it may be remarked, were no longer apparently claimed as a right, but 'by ancient and approved' custom. The abbots of Langdon and St. Radegund were charged by the Chapter under the severest censures to publish, during the solemnity of the Mass, the excommunication pronounced by it against all the English abbots. They were to warn all the canons to have no dealings with the abbots whilst they remained under the sentence, and to declare to the abbots themselves that under pain of deposition they must personally appear at Prémontré to answer for their disobedience.

Abbot Adam this year, after celebrating the Prémontré Chapter, went to Vienne, where a General Council—the same which sealed the doom of the Templars—had assembled on October 16. Thence, on February 10, 1311–12, the Abbot General sent the English abbots a reminder of his existence and of his determination to bring them back to a sense of their duty. He had been very kind to them, he says in this letter, and had granted them many privileges in former days ; but now, as they were all under the sentence of excommunication passed upon them by General Chapter of the Order, he desired to recall all favours previously granted, and he ordered the abbot of Langdon to publish this revocation for him.

Abbot Adam, however, did not have it all his own way. Pope Clement V., to whom the English had appealed for protection, appointed Cardinal Peter Colonna to act for him as auditor, or judge. On March 17, the Cardinal, being then also at Vienne for the council, after having listened to the proctors of the two parties, issued a prohibition to the Abbot of Prémontré. By this document he was commanded not to do anything in the matter or to issue any sentence whilst the case was pending, and it condemned him to pay all costs and a further sum in compensation for damage in the event of his disregarding this peremptory admonition. Even this, however, does not appear to have made the Abbot pause in his endeavour to vindicate what he held to be the rights of the mother house of the Order. On April 14, 1312, his agents in England, the abbots of Langdon and St. Radegund, again issued a notice of his excommunication against the recalcitrant English superiors, and further absolved all their subjects from obedience to them. They again, according to their instructions, warned the canons generally to hold no converse or communication with any of their abbots so long as they remained under the sentence, and they commanded the Priors of the various houses to notify the orders of the Abbot of Prémontré to their respective superiors. This sentence was repeated on April 30, to guard against any plea of ignorance.

It must have been throughout a difficult and anxious position for the English abbots, although in point of fact it is surprising how little appears to have come from the terrible threats and sentences, peremptory citations and judgments, not to name all the censures and excommunications which were flying about. The general reader is irresistibly reminded of the classic lines in *The Jackdaw of Rheims*, which describe the apparent result when the Cardinal

> 'called for his candle, his bell, and his book.'
>
> 'Never was heard such a terrible curse!
> But what gave rise to no little surprise,
> Nobody seemed one penny the worse!'

Apparently conscious of the royal power and protection behind them, the abbots, having launched their appeal to the Pope, could afford to possess their souls in patience and regard the fulminations of their foreign superior as calculated merely to relieve his feelings without hurting them, so long as their case was pending.

On May 6, 1312, the English proctors wrote from Vienne, and their letter contained some cheering news. On the vigil of the Ascension one of them had presented to the Abbot of Prémontré the formal document of prohibition, above referred to, which was issued by Cardinal Colonna against his proceeding further. Abbot Adam was much upset. In fact the proctors evidently took a little malicious pleasure in reporting that 'he was made so ill from grief and mortification at this unexpected result that he kept to his room for five days and never left his house at all.' The English abbots, they add, need have no fear as to the result. 'Master William de Staping,' the proctor, will certainly gain the cause provided that '*id abundanter habeat quod oportet*'—which being interpreted means, if he be kept well supplied with money. Already the Abbot of Begham had obtained judgment against the Abbot of Prémontré for eighty golden florins, and in the general cause the English abbots would long ago have got absolution from the censures pronounced against them from Prémontré had they asked for it. Finally there is no doubt, they say, as they are told frequently by the official, that the said Father Abbot will utterly fail to carry his cause in the Curia, if Master William, the proctor, lives and remains to fight for the English. The said William, they add, has gained a great reputation in the Curia and is looked upon as 'the very flower of the English nation.'

Two days later, May 8, the above-named William Staping, the agent at Vienne, writes more at length to William de Kyrkton, the general proctor in England of the English abbots. A great deal of money, he admits, had already been spent upon this appeal. The truth is that the proctors of Abbot Adam had promised great sums for the reversal of what had hitherto

been obtained in the way of inhibition ; but they had failed. There was much still to be done to secure the position, and the agent William does not hope to be able to obtain a full absolution even *ad cautelam* before St. Michael's day. The fact is that new charges have been made against the English by the Prémontré authorities, but the English canons may take it that in the end the Abbot will 'get a fall' if he proceed. Further funds, he says, are urgently needed, and he hopes they will be sent him before the autumn is out. There is a rumour that it is not unlikely that in the General Council then being held the Abbot of Prémontré will lose his exemption from episcopal control, unless he can obtain it again from the Pope and Cardinals. To account in some way for the great delay, the agent points out that several of the necessary documents were badly drawn in a legal sense, and matters of importance were even left out altogether. This necessitated recalling them all and again drafting them correctly : all of which had taken time.

The final result at the Curia does not appear in the present collection of documents. Peace, however, was restored in some way between Prémontré and the abbots of the English province. On February 25, 1313–4, Abbot Adam wrote to his agent, the abbot of Langdon, that, as he understood the recalcitrant prelates were anxious to return to their obedience, he might absolve them from the sentences pronounced against them. This olive branch was apparently accepted, for a final agreement was arrived at in the General Chapter held in 1315. To end the dispute it was allowed that the English abbots, instead of undergoing yearly the danger and expense of a journey to Prémontré for the Chapter, should be represented by the visitors only and such others as might for some purpose be specially summoned. The Abbot of Prémontré might indeed visit the English province yearly if he so desired ; but then only his bare personal expenses were to be defrayed by the houses. If he pleased he might depute visitors to act for him every five years. Further, only necessary collections should be made

from the English houses, and these only after they had been approved by the General Chapter and the amount to be charged had been approved by the visitors. This practically ended the great case. The victory certainly lay with the English, and although some few of the papers in this collection seem to suggest that there were still slight difficulties at times, the principle had been settled once for all and in accordance with the English contention. The Sovereign also evidently kept an eye upon the Order to see that his commands about not taking money out of the kingdom for the use of Prémontré were attended to. In 1343, for example, the King, who was then of course Edward III., hearing that the Abbot of Prémontré was again trying to claim the payment of subsidies, forestalled him by a prohibition. He also ordered the sheriff of Northumberland to see that none of the northern abbots paid the demands.

It has been already suggested that the collection of early documents, about the quarrel between Prémontré and England as to the payment of subsidies and tallages, was made by Bishop Redman, when, as visitor and representative of the foreign superior in England, he had a threatened repetition of the previous difficulties. The papers were undoubtedly the best precedents to guide him in dealing with the matter. After many complaints that the demand he had made upon the English houses had not been attended to, in 1488 Herbert, then Abbot of Prémontré, wrote a formal protest to Bishop Redman. He bade him collect at once what was due and forward it without delay. He threatened the superiors with penalties if they did not comply, in much the same way as Abbot Adam had a hundred and fifty years before. He further suggested that if the actual cash could not be obtained the equivalent value should be sent in English merchandise. Almost any kind would be acceptable to them abroad, he says, and especially if it took the form of good white cloth suitable for their habits, or a good and sure ambler, as a sure-footed horse, gentle and quiet in its paces, could rarely be found in those parts. To this strong remonstrance Bishop Redman replied that he

had done his best for Prémontré, and had contrived, sometimes by threats and sometimes by persuasion, to obtain what had been demanded. It was right however, he says, that the Abbot of Prémontré should realise once for all that the English abbots do not in any way allow and never have allowed the justice of the claim. They allege a general and binding composition made with Abbot Adam de Crecy on the matter, as well as a Statute of the Realm, actually and in so many words, forbidding them to send money over the sea to a foreign superior under pain of treason and forfeiture of goods. The Bishop, however, sent the Abbot a copy of what the English houses had been wont to give, and he promised to try to procure the white cloth and other things the Abbot wanted. The cloth, he adds, had been sent once before, but it had been captured by pirates.

Sufficient, however, and indeed more than sufficient, has been said upon this matter, for after all, though important, the money difficulties form really only an episode in the story of the English Premonstratensians as revealed to us in the documents collected in these two Registers. There are, of course, records of a great number of Chapters held in England in the fifteenth century, which, curiously enough, were for some reason or other never celebrated in any house of the Order, but usually in the church attached to some friary. These papers are useful, but not so important as they might have been had their acts been fuller and possessed of a more legislative character. A good deal of the discussions is taken up with directions about the dress of the canons, and it is perhaps not uninteresting to learn that these White Canons had at one time adopted *black* habits in England, and had to be recalled to their original colour lest they should be confused with the Black, or Austin, Canons. The rochet also seems to have caused a good deal of difficulty at various times. Some obtained permission to wear it, and thus of course others wanted it, and so finally its use became general. Towards the close of the century the celebration of Chapters became the occasions of a display, or ecclesiastical pageant,

on the part of the Premonstratensians. On one occasion Bishop Redman writes round begging all the prelates to bring copes with them to the meeting, so that the procession might possess due solemnity. On another he asks all the abbots to bring their crosiers and other *pontificalia*, as it was intended to make the procession at Nottingham as gorgeous as possible.

Another important matter in the religious life well illustrated in this collection of papers is the visitation of the monasteries of the Order during Bishop Redman's time. It must in truth be confessed that there was a good deal to correct; but one thing certainly appears, and that is that the visitor never shirked his duty in any way, and never condoned offences without satisfactory, and indeed frequently severe, punishment of the guilty party. There is very little evidence, I fear, of any revival of studies or learning among these canons, or any great desire to attain to the higher ideals of the canonical rule of life. Still it is always unsafe to take the records of visitations, still more the injunctions made at the time, as complete evidence of the general tone. The very purpose of a visitation is to point out shortcomings and to insist upon reform, and whilst stress is necessarily laid in the records upon failings, there is, on the other hand, no notice at all of much useful work or of any good observance. In the accounts of these visitations we have many records of the journeys made by the visitor, the rates of progress from place to place, and where he was housed by the way. It is impossible not to be struck with the rapidity with which he frequently moved from one point to another. In relation to these and to the many elections recorded in the Register we have numerous lists of the canons of various houses, and our knowledge of the names of the abbots is greatly increased. A few inventories are preserved, none perhaps of any very great interest, and some English letters, whilst a great number of forms of citation and election and drafts of addresses, at the meetings of Chapters or by the visitor presiding at a visitation or election, are scattered over the volume. On the

whole, therefore, I fully believe that not only will these collections add materially to our knowledge about the English White Canons, but they will be found not wholly devoid of interest even to those whose studies are not directed along these lines of historical inquiry.

THE INTELLECTUAL INFLUENCE OF ENGLISH MONASTICISM BETWEEN THE TENTH AND THE TWELFTH CENTURIES

By MISS R. GRAHAM

Read June 18th, 1903

I

At the opening of the tenth century monasticism was at its lowest ebb in England. King Alfred's attempts to revive the regular life had failed; some of the monasteries were homes of married priests, many more were ruinous and deserted. When Edgar had come into his kingdom, and was able to fulfil the vow which he had made as a boy to restore the monasteries to their former splendour,[1] the time was ripe for success. The land had recovered from the ravages of war, and 'the three torches'[2] of the Church—Dunstan, Athelwold, and Oswald—were ready to guide him. However, the brief but brilliant revival was checked by national disaster. From the time of the renewed Danish invasions monastic life steadily languished.

The result of the Norman Conquest was a great monastic revival. Under the rule of Lanfranc and their Norman abbots the English Benedictines[3] attained a higher standard of life and of learning. Following the example of William the Conqueror, the Norman barons manifested conspicuous

[1] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, p. 290 (R.S.)

[2] *Chronicon Abbatiæ Rameseiensis*, ed. W. D. Macray, p. 25 (R.S.)

[3] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Pontificum Anglorum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, p. 70 (R.S.)

zeal in the founding of monasteries, and year by year the number increased. The new monastic orders, Augustinians, Cistercians, Præmonstratensians, Gilbertines, and others, gained numerous foundations in the course of the twelfth century. At the close, indeed, English monasticism was at its full flood. Its intellectual influence from the tenth to the twelfth century varied very much in extent and in intensity.

II

'Until Dunstan and Athelwold revived learning in the monastic life,' wrote Ælfric, Abbot of Eynsham, 'no English priest could either write a letter in Latin, or understand one.'[1] The language of exaggeration was pardonable in the monk, who viewed with enthusiasm the diffusion of education at the end of the tenth century, and thus appropriated King Alfred's description of the state of learning in his own day.[2] Alfred's high estimate of the value of education as a factor in the good government of the country[3] and his efforts to extend it were so far successful, that even in the first half of the tenth century it was usual for children of good birth to receive some instruction. Odo, Archbishop of Canterbury (942–959), was taught 'by a certain religious man while a boy in the household of the thegn Athelhelm.'[4] His friend Frithegode, to whom he entrusted the education of his nephew Oswald, was said 'to have been skilled in all the learning of that age in England, both secular and divine.'[5] The characteristics of the style of Odo[6] and Frithegode,[7] their long-

[1] *Ælfrici Grammatica Latino-Saxonica*, p. 2; Appendix to *Dictionarium Saxonico-Latino-Anglicum*, ed. Somner, 1659.

[2] *King Alfred's West-Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care*, ed. H. Sweet, p. 3 (E.E.T.S.)

[3] Camden, *Anglica Scripta*, ed. 1603, p. 21 (Asserus de Ælfredi Rebus Gestis).

[4] *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, i. 404 (R.S.)

[5] *Chronicon Abbatiæ Rameseiensis*, ed. W. D. Macray, p. 21 (R.S.)

[6] *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, i. 105–107.

[7] *Ibid.* pp. 107–159.

winded and pretentious language and their frequent use of Latinised Greek words, were very similar to that of the numerous charters granted in the reigns of Edward the Elder and Athelstan.[1] Moreover the extremely technical character of the charters leads to the conclusion that there must have been some special institution for drawing them up and a number of highly trained clerks. The aged priest, whom the monks of St. Albans found able to read the British books unearthed in the excavations at Verulam during the rule of Abbot Eadmer, was also well skilled in learning.[2]

It is possible, too, as Alfred had set forth as an ideal,[3] that many of the sons of freemen learnt to read in their own tongue. It was for secular men who turned to the monastic life and knew no Latin[4] that King Edgar ordered Athelwold, Bishop of Winchester, to translate the Rule of St. Benedict.[5] Before the revival of learning, therefore, the teachers must have been the parish priests, and the men living in the collegiate churches and such of the older monasteries as had not been deserted after the coming of the Danes.

The lands obtained in the reigns of Edward the Elder and Athelstan by the religious houses of Wenlock,[6] Taunton,[7] Bath,[8] Abingdon,[9] Sherborne,[10] Worcester,[11] Winchester,[12]

[1] *Cartularium Saxonicum*, ed. W. de Gray Birch, ii. *passim*, e.g. 423, 579, 895. Cf. *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Pontificum Anglorum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, p. 70: 'Id in omnibus antiquis cartis est animadvertere quantum quibusdam verbis abstrusis et ex Græco petitis delectentur.'

[2] *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani*, ed. H. T. Riley, i. 26. It is clear that the revival under Abbot Eadmer was contemporary with the general revival in Edgar's reign.

[3] *Alfred's West-Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care*, ed. H. Sweet (E.E.T.S.)

[4] *Leechdoms, Wortcunning, and Starcraft*, ed. O. Cockayne, iii. 441, 443 (R.S.)

[5] *Liber Eliensis*, ed. D. J. Stewart, p. 153 (Anglia Christiana Society).

[6] *Cartularium Saxonicum*, ed. W. de Gray Birch, ii. 229.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 272.

[8] *Ibid.* p. 351.

[9] *Ibid.* p. 373, 'ad usus monachorum Dei inibi degentium,' A.D. 931.

[10] *Ibid.* p. 394.

[11] *Ibid.* p. 399.

[12] *Ibid.* p. 408, 'ad refectorium fratribus et ad vestimenta,' A.D. 934.

Malmesbury[1] and others show that their inhabitants bore the name of monks and were revered as such. In reality, however, their lives appear to have differed so little from those of the secular priests that Ælfric was justified in saying that in 963 there were no monks in England except at Glastonbury and Abingdon.[2]

In Athelstan's reign the church and other buildings were still standing at Glastonbury, and clerks under the name of monks dwelt within them. Dunstan's parents brought him there to school when he was quite a little boy, and he made rapid progress in learning, quickly outstripping all the scholars of his own age.[3] He studied the Vulgate and such works of the Fathers as he found there. His masters in secular learning were the Irish scholars who came as pilgrims to Glastonbury to visit the tomb of Patrick the Younger.[4] These successors to Clement the Scot, Joannes Scotus, and a host of others were no doubt like them driven out from their own land by the pressure of poverty ; but at Glastonbury, too, they found that they had not the wherewithal to live. Accordingly, they set up a school there for the children of high birth, and, as was the practice in the schools of France from the time of the Carolingian revival, they asked no fees for their instruction, but relied, with good reason, on the liberality of the thegns. From these teachers, and with the help of their books, Dunstan seems to have made some study of the different branches of learning included in the Trivium and the Quadrivium.[5] Possibly, too, he acquired some knowledge of Greek. However, such learning as Dunstan's was not the common possession of other young men of his own rank, and it exposed him to the charge 'of studying the vain poems and trifling histories of ancient paganism to be a worker of magic.'[6] A serious illness following upon his disappointments at court led him to take monastic vows to which Ælfheah the Bald,

[1] *Cartularium Saxonicum*, ed. W. de Gray Birch, ii. p. 423.
[2] *Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*, ed. J. Stevenson, ii. 259 (R.S.)
[3] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, p. 7.
[4] *Ibid.* pp. 10, 74, 256. [5] *Ibid.* p. 257. [6] *Ibid.* p. 11.

Bishop of Winchester, had previously urged him.[1] In 946 King Edmund seated him in the abbot's chair at Glastonbury.

Under Dunstan Glastonbury continued to be rather a school than a monastery. The Rule of St. Benedict was then unknown in England, and even in the seventh century it had only been firmly established at Wearmouth and Jarrow. As Dunstan relied solely on tradition and his own judgment in setting up his model of the regular life, the monasticism of Glastonbury differed as much from the pure Benedictinism of Fleury as from that of the secular clerks. His most distinguished scholar was Athelwold, who had been ordained priest with him by Ælfheah the Bald. Under Dunstan's guidance Athelwold attained 'a generous skill in the art of grammar and the honeyed sweetness of verse,' . . . he read the Bible and 'the catholic and most famous authors.'[2]

In 953[3] Athelwold was chosen by King Edred to be abbot of the monastery which he proposed to restore at Abingdon. Five clerks of Glastonbury accompanied Athelwold, and in the ten years of his abbacy he received fifty monks. Zeal for learning, the special feature of the restored monasteries of Glastonbury and Abingdon, was further strengthened by intercourse with Ghent,[4] Corbeil,[5] and especially with Fleury, which, after its recent reform by Odo, second Abbot of Cluny, was a model of strict Benedictine observance and famous alike for its school and library.[6]

Oswald, Bishop of Worcester and Archbishop of York, had profited much by his sojourn at Fleury, and soon after the founding of Ramsey Abbey in 968, 'as the study of letters and the use of schools had almost died out in England,'[7] he requested the Abbot of Fleury to send a teacher to rule the

[1] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, p. 14.

[2] Wulfstan, 'Vita St. Æthelwoldi,' Migne, *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*, cxxxvii. 87.

[3] *Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*, ed. J. Stevenson, ii. 258.

[4] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, p. 101.

[5] *Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*, ed J. Stevenson, i. 129.

[6] 'Rules for Monks and Secular Canons after the Revival under King Edgar,' by Mary Bateson. Cf. *English Historical Review*, 1894, pp. 690, 691.

[7] *Chronicon Abbatiæ Rameseiensis*, ed. W. D. Macray, p. 42.

schools at Ramsey. The choice fell upon Abbo, who was versed in all of the seven Arts of the Trivium and Quadrivium.[1] He spent two years at Ramsey, during which he diligently instructed the monks. For his English scholars he wrote the treatise 'Quæstiones Grammaticales,'[2] with the metrical prologue, destined, as Mr. Macray has pointed out, 'to test their knowledge alike of language and astronomy.'[3] It was at the urgent request of the monks of Ramsey that he laid aside for a time the study of secular literature to write the 'Passio Sancti Edmundi.' He had heard Dunstan tell the story in the Latin tongue to Ælfstan, Bishop of Rochester, Ælfric, Abbot of Malmesbury, and others who were standing around.[4] In his preface he pleaded the monks' insistence that his book would give pleasure to the Archbishop, and would be no useless monument of so small a man as himself.[5] It seems probable, too, that Abbo wished his work to serve as a model of Latin style in the school of Ramsey and elsewhere, for, in contrast to the turgid writing of the tenth century in England, the 'Passio Sancti Edmundi' has a distinct classical flavour.[6] After the manner of Livy or Cicero, Abbo attributed long speeches to the various actors in the drama, interspersing them with appropriate classical quotations. A notable exception, however, was the use by a messenger of 'parcere subjectis et debellare superbos' as a description of the conduct of the fierce Dane Inguar towards his enemies.[7] Other passages again recall the 'Æneid.'

The influence of Abbo's classical teaching at Ramsey is of considerable interest. In the Life of St. Oswald,[8] written between 995 and 1005 by a contemporary monk of Ramsey,

[1] 'Vita Sancti Abbonis,' Migne, *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*, cxxxix. 390.
[2] Migne, *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*, cxxxix. 521–534.
[3] *Chronicon Abbatiæ Rameseiensis*, ed. W. D. Macray, p. xxvii.
[4] *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, ed. T. Arnold, i. 3.
[5] *Ibid.*
[6] E.g. *ibid.* p. 9. 'Quem, præda facta . . . innoxios.'
[7] *Ibid.* p. 11.
[8] *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, i. 399–475.

some of the features of the 'Passio Sancti Edmundi' may be observed. Like Abbo, the author was a man of considerable culture and learning, though he made a far more pedantic use of it;[1] like his master, too, he occasionally attempted to give a Virgilian flavour to his writing,[2] but the national tradition had too strong an influence over him. He could not resist the desire to reproduce the enthusiastic rhetoric of Anglo-Saxon poetry in his Latin prose, and the mystical language of the Song of Solomon appealed forcibly to him. Another of Abbo's pupils at Ramsey was Byrhtferth, who wrote commentaries on Bede's mathematical treatises: these show that he too had read widely and was well acquainted with Latin authors.[3]

The restoration of forty monasteries[4] for men in the reigns of Edgar and his sons under the influence of Dunstan, Athelwold, and Oswald resulted probably in the founding of as many schools. Five of these religious houses were restored by Dunstan, eight by Athelwold, seven by Oswald. The abbots were their choice. Ælfric of Malmesbury Dunstan knew to be a man 'of much religion and very great learning;'[5] Wulsy, Abbot of Westminster, and afterwards Bishop of Sherborne, was another of his famous pupils.[6] Osgar of Abingdon, Ethelgar of New Minster, Brihtnoth of Ely, Adulf of Peterborough, were all *discipuli* of Athelwold at Abingdon or Winchester.[7] The first bands of monks sent to Winchester, New Minster, Ely, Peterborough, and Thorney had been trained at Abingdon.[8] The same filiation can be traced in the monasteries of Mercia and East Anglia. The first twelve monks of Ramsey were

[1] E.g. *ibid.* pp. 399, 400.

[2] E.g. *ibid.* p. 413. 'Hortante'. . . tripudio.'

[3] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, pp. xviii, xix.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 214. Of forty-eight, eight were for women. Cf. *Fasti Monastici ævi Saxonici*, ed. W. de Gray Birch.

[5] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, p. 302.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 304. *Cf.* also p. 209.

[7] Wulfstan, 'Vita S. Æthelwoldi,' Migne, *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*, cxxxvii. 92, 93.

[8] *Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*, ed. J. Stevenson, i. 348.

sent by Oswald from Westbury with their Prior Germanus,[1] the Winchester clerk who had lived many months at Fleury. Winsig, the first Prior of Worcester, was trained at Ramsey.[2]

In France from the ninth century onwards there were two distinct schools in the monasteries, the 'scholæ claustrales' for the oblates, or children dedicated by their parents to the monastic life, and the 'scholæ canonicæ' or 'clericales,' for clerks and laymen of noble birth.[3] Both were directed by the monks, but the discipline and course of studies differed.[4] At Fleury there had certainly been two distinct schools since 855,[5] and the usage was therefore well known to Oswald,[6] to Germanus,[7] Prior of Westbury, and Osgar,[8] the successor of Athelwold as Abbot of Abingdon. Fleury, too, had recently been reformed by Odo, Abbot of Cluny, and the very essence of the Cluniac Rule was the absolute separation of the oblate in his school,[9] and that wellnigh intolerable supervision which drew forth the enthusiastic comment of Udalric in the eleventh century: 'Whenever I saw with what zeal the boys are guarded day and night, I said in my heart it would be difficult for a king's son to be educated with greater diligence in a palace than even the smallest boy at Cluny.'[10] The capitulary of 817, in which Louis the Pious and Benedict of Aniane laid down that none but oblates should be taught within the monastery,[11] and that no secular clerk or layman should be lodged there,[12] was in the hands of the English

[1] *Chronicon Abbatiæ Rameseiensis*, ed. W. D. Macray, p. 36.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 41.

[3] *Les Écoles épiscopales et monastiques de l'Occident*, par Léon Maître, pp. 198, 199.

[4] *L'Abbaye du Bec et ses Écoles*, par M. L'Abbé Porrée, p. 24.

[5] Matthew Arnold, *Schools and Universities on the Continent*, p. 6. *Cf.* Migne, *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*, cxxxix. 387. 'Talibus ergo Abbo ortus parentibus in Floriacensi monasterio scholæ clericorum ecclesiæ Sancti Petri obsequentium traditur litteris imbuendus.'

[6] *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, i. 413–419.

[7] *Chronicon Abbatiæ Rameseiensis*, ed. W. D. Macray, p. 24.

[8] *Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*, ed. J. Stevenson, ii. 259.

[9] D'Achery, *Spicilegium*, ed. 1655–77, iv. 175–183.

[10] *Ibid.* p. 183.

[11] Pertz, *Monumenta Germaniæ Historica: Leges*, i. 202, cap. 45.

[12] *Ibid.* p. 202, cap. 42.

reformers.[1] Nevertheless, there is no evidence that they accepted the distinction between the schools. At Glastonbury and Abingdon the revival of learning preceded the introduction of the new Benedictinism from Ghent and Fleury. Dunstan's scholars were of all ages, from the little boy [2] to the man who had already taken priest's orders ;[3] the clerks [4] of the household maintained for the services of Glastonbury by Ethelfleda were doubtless among them. Athelwold taught in the school of his cathedral monastery, not scorning even to explain the difficulties of Donatus and Priscian to little boys.[5] Old and young were alike his pupils,[6] and it is important to note that many of them became secular priests.[7]

Possibly in the school of the chief city of the kingdom the clerks who drew up the charters of Edgar and Æthelred received some of their education, for until Canute instituted the royal chancery [8] there is no evidence in England of the existence of a palace school such as that of Charles the Great or Otto I. The preambles of the charters only grew longer as the century advanced,[9] and retained throughout the same characteristics of style as the earlier ones, the characteristics too of the writing of Athelwold,[10] and his disciples Lantfred [11] and Wulfstan.[12]

[1] *English Historical Review*, 1894, pp. 693–5, for a list of English manuscripts containing copies of Benedict of Aniane's 'Memoriale' and the Epitome, the Capitulary of 817, the Rule of St. Benedict with an Anglo-Saxon translation. Among the books marked by John of Glastonbury in 1247 in the library catalogue as 'vetustissimi' were the 'Decreta Caroli et Ludovici regum.' *Cf.* Joannes Glastoniensis, *Chronica*, ed. T. Hearne, pp. 423–444.

[2] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, pp. 28, 46.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 261.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 175.

[5] 'Ælfrici Grammatica Latino-Saxonica,' p. 1 ; Appendix to *Dictionarium Saxonico-Latino-Anglicum*, ed. Somner, 1659.

[6] Wulfstan, 'Vita Sancti Æthelwoldi,' Migne, *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*, cxxxvii. 91.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 95.

[8] J. R. Green, *The Conquest of England*, pp. 544, 545.

[9] *Cartularium Saxonicum*, ed. W. de Gray Birch, iii. *passim*, e.g. pp. 308, 450, 453.

[10] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vol. i. p. xxvii.

[11] 'Miracula S. Swithuni, Wintoniensis Episcopi, per Lantfredum, Wintoniensem Monachum,' MS. Cotton, Nero E 1, ff. 33–51. For his introductory epistle cf. *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, p. 370.

[12] *Vita S. Swithuni, versibus hexametris, per Wolstanum, MS. Reg.* 15, C. vii.

In the absence of direct evidence it is only possible to speculate as to the reasons why the schools were not divided in the English monasteries. So rigid a distinction would not have been in accordance with the fusion of Church and State in every sphere, the special feature of English history before the Norman Conquest. The capitularies of Charles the Great[1] were also known to the reformers. Though schools were established in the monasteries by his capitulary of 787,[2] the separation was not mooted until the capitulary of Louis the Pious in 817. The English bishops may well have decided, as their own system worked very well, that they would not introduce the foreign distinction unless necessity arose. There is no evidence before 1066 of any change. Wulfstan, afterwards Bishop of Worcester (1062–1095), was educated within the monasteries of Evesham and Peterborough: he was not an oblate, for he afterwards joined as a layman in the sports of other young men of his age.[3]

In the 'Concordia Regularis' only a glimpse of the 'school' of boys is to be seen as they come in and go out of church with their masters.[4] Ælfric, however, has given an interesting picture of the boys coming to their master for instruction in his 'Colloquium ad Pueros Linguæ Latinæ Locutione exercendos.'[5] The chief spokesman was the lad who was already professed a monk, but his young companions were ploughboys, shepherds, neatherds, hunters, fishers, bird-catchers, chapmen, tailors, salters, and bakers. The 'Colloquium' also throws some light on the discipline of the school: the boys recognised the virtue in a flogging, but trusted the master to temper justice with mercy.[6] The boys at Ramsey had leave from their master at certain hours in the week to go outside the cloister for play and amusement, and it was

[1] *Cf.* note 1, p. 9.

[2] Bass Mullinger, *The Schools of Charles the Great*, pp. 97–99.

[3] Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*, ii. 244, 245, 'Willelmus Malmesbiriensis de Vita S. Wlstani Episcopi Wigornensis.'

[4] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vol. i. pp. xxx, xxxi.

[5] *Analecta Anglo-Saxonica*, ed. B. Thorpe, pp. 18–36.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 18.

on one of these occasions that four of them happened to break one of the church-bells.[1] It is probable that the co-education of the future monk, clerk, and layman was the cause of milder discipline in England. The traditional gentleness of St. Dunstan is shown in the stories of his appearance on two occasions to protect Osbern (fl. 1090) and the Canterbury schoolboys from the harsh discipline of their masters.[2]

The curriculum of studies in the monastic schools included such knowledge of the Trivium and Quadrivium as was then known in England; but it must have varied greatly in the different monasteries, for throughout the Middle Ages, owing to the comparative scarcity of books, everything depended on the capacity of the individual teacher. Probably many of the scholars, especially of those who were going out into the world again, did not get beyond the Trivium, of which the most important art was grammar. The text-books used were naturally Donatus and Priscian.[3] Finding, perhaps from experience, that these were very difficult for little boys, Ælfric wrote a Saxon Latin grammar which he dedicated to them as a preparatory book.[4] Several other schoolbooks of precisely the same nature as the 'Colloquium' have been preserved:[5] they are specially interesting as illustrations of the methods of teaching languages. Many Anglo-Saxon and Latin glossaries, too, are still extant. At the end of the tenth century some knowledge of Latin seems to have been pretty widely diffused; but as Ælfric then complained of many false translations from Latin into the vernacular,[6] the zeal of the authors must have exceeded their scholarship. Ælfric showed great anxiety, too, that the scribes who copied

[1] *Chronicon Abbatiæ Rameseiensis*, ed. W. D. Macray, pp. 112, 113.

[2] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, pp. 137, 141.

[3] 'Ælfrici Grammatica Latino-Saxonica;' Appendix to *Dictionarium Saxonico-Latino-Anglicum*, ed. Somner, 1659, p. 1.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] E.g. *Leechdoms, Wortcunning, and Starcraft*, ed. O. Cockayne, vol. i. pp. lvi, lviii, lxiii, lxviii.

[6] Ælfric's *Homilies*, ed. B. Thorpe, i. 3.

his books should not introduce errors into them.[1] Monks and clergy learned some arithmetic and astronomy, in order to calculate the feasts of the Church aright, and some elements of the theory of music.

The question of the teaching of Greek in the English monastic schools in the tenth century is a difficult one to answer. It has already been suggested as possible that Dunstan learnt Greek from his Irish masters. It was to an Irish bishop that St. Bruno turned when he needed a Greek teacher for the palace school of Otto the Great.[2] If Dunstan had some knowledge of the language, perhaps he taught it to Athelwold and others of his more distinguished pupils. Among the books given by Athelwold to Peterborough was one with the title 'De Literis Græcorum.'[3] On the other hand the verdict of Dietrich, the German commentator on Ælfric, is that he knew no Greek.[4] If Athelwold taught it at Winchester it is difficult to believe that Ælfric, who spent many years in his school,[5] should not have learnt it, though he certainly pleaded that there were many in England more learned than himself.[6] There are hundreds of Greek words in numerous glossaries, and on the whole it is safer to conclude that, with rare exceptions, the knowledge of Greek was confined to these.[7]

The monastic bishops of the tenth century realised that even with the revival of about forty monastic schools only a comparatively small section of the nation could receive education within them. Moreover, with the doubtful exception of Ripon,[8] there was no monastery north of the

[1] Ælfric's *Homilies*, ed. B. Thorpe, i. p. 9. Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*, ed. W. W. Skeat, i. 7 (E.E.T.S.)

[2] R. L. Poole, *Illustrations of the History of Mediæval Thought*, p. 85, n. 7.

[3] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, i. 382.

[4] Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*, ed. W. W. Skeat, vol. ii. pp. xliv.

[5] *Compotus Rolls of the Obedientiaries of St. Swithun's*, ed. G. W. Kitchin, p. 175, in *Ælfric's Abridgment of St. Ethelwold's Concordia Regularis*, ed. Mary Bateson.

[6] *Homilies of Ælfric*, ed. B. Thorpe, i. 9.

[7] *Leechdoms, Wortcunning, and Starcraft*, ed. O. Cockayne, vol. i. p. lvii. Cf. *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, p. cxxii.

[8] *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, i. 462.

Humber. The bulk of the people, therefore, had to depend on the parish priests, and accordingly the bishops exercised a careful supervision over them to see that the teaching imparted was as good and as suitable as possible. In this respect, too, the bishops looked back for precedents to the revival of learning under Charles the Great. They took the Capitulary of Theodulf of Orleans [1] as their guide, and the English translation was furnished most probably by Ælfric.[2] Theodulf had laid down that every mass-priest must keep a free school for little boys, but he might receive from their relations what they were willing to give of their own accord.[3] Any priest who wished to put his nephew or any of his relations to learning at any of the churches in the bishop's charge must apply to him, and he would willingly grant his request.[4] In England some at least of the priests had had the privilege of monastic education,[5] but they were forbidden to look down on their less learned brethren,[6] or to take away their scholars from them without their consent.[7] All were commanded to teach the young diligently.[8] In no canon perhaps is the influence of Dunstan more clearly shown than in that enjoining on every priest the knowledge of some handicraft ; [9] thereby he would increase knowledge, and by training his pupils in it he would make them useful for his Church.[10] It would be interesting to know how much the people availed themselves of the opportunities offered them for the education of their children. The indication of six days in the month on which it was good to put children to school,[11] by the author of a book of prognostics, suggests that it was a common practice, but he gave no clue to the classes of the nation for whom he was writing.

In the other countries of Western Europe in which the

[1] Migne, *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*, cv. 196, capp. ccxix, ccxx.
[2] Wilkins, *Concilia*, i. 207.
[3] *Ibid.* c. xx. [4] *Ibid.* c. xix. [5] *Cf.* p. 9, n. 7.
[6] Wilkins, *Concilia*, i. 226, cap. xii. [7] *Ibid.* p. 225, cap. x.
[8] *Ibid.* p. 228, cap. li. [9] *Ibid.* p. 225, cap. xi. [10] *Ibid.* p. 228, cap. li.
[11] *Leechdoms, Wortcunning, and Starcraft*, ed. O. Cockayne, iii. 185, 187, 189, 191, 193.

cathedrals were always served by secular canons there were also episcopal schools,[1] but, with the exception of Chartres [2] at the beginning of the eleventh century, they did not attain such fame as those of the monasteries. In England, in Dunstan's old age, there is some evidence of an episcopal school at Canterbury,[3] but the existence of any others is mere conjecture. It is possible that other monastic bishops of cathedrals in the possession of secular clerks gathered scholars around them. Elfweard, Bishop of London (1035–1044), previously monk of Ramsey and Abbot of Evesham, Etheric and Eadnoth, two Ramsey monks, who succeeded each other as Bishops of Dorchester (1016–1034; 1034–1050), were perhaps among them.

Episcopal schools which depend on individual bishops must be carefully distinguished from schools attached to secular cathedrals. Nothing is known of any schools attached to collegiate churches, whether of cathedral dignity or not, during the monastic revival in the reigns of Edgar and his sons. After the Danish conquest collegiate churches again became popular, and Canute favoured them as well as the monasteries.[4] He has indeed been praised by later monastic authors as a promoter of education. Writing before 1090, Hermann of Bury stated that Canute supported boys at both collegiate and monastic schools.[5] Abbot Samson of Bury (1182–1211), himself a schoolmaster, credited Canute with the foundation of a number of grammar schools.[6] Between thirty and forty churches for secular canons are registered in Domesday Book, and a number of these were founded in the reign of Edward the Confessor.[7] It seems probable that, as at Waltham,[8] a school was included in these foundations.

[1] Léon Maître, *Les Écoles épiscopales et monastiques de l'Occident*, 768–1180, p. 173.

[2] R. L. Poole, *Illustrations of the History of Mediæval Thought*, p. 113.

[3] *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, ed. T. Arnold, i. 3. Cf. *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, p. lvii.

[4] W. Hunt, *A History of the English Church from its Foundation to the Norman Conquest*, p. 394.

[5] *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, ed. T. Arnold, i. 46. [6] *Ibid.* p. 126.

[7] *The Foundation of Waltham Abbey*, ed. W. Stubbs, p. vi.

[8] *Ibid.* p. 15, *cf.* p. 35.

The contents of the English monastic libraries are very suggestive. In the catalogue made by John of Glastonbury of the library in 1247,[1] a considerable number of books are marked as 'vetustissimi.' Many of these were written in English, some of them are set down as useless, others as illegible. It may be concluded, therefore, that these formed the library of the monastery before the Norman Conquest and that most of them were written at the period of its greatest literary activity under Dunstan [2] and his immediate successors. These books included copies of the Bible and of its separate books in Latin and in English, many with glosses, some of the works of the Fathers and of the Carolingian theologians, the historical and theological works of Bede, the writings of Alcuin and Aldhelm, some collections of the older canons, several books of English sermons, many lives of the saints, medical treatises, and the usual text-books such as Donatus and Priscian. The investigation of the sources used by Ælfric justifies the belief that much the same set of books was contained in the Winchester library.[3] From Glastonbury and Winchester many other monastic libraries would be supplied.[4] The English Church alone of all national Churches in the tenth and first half of the eleventh centuries had an extensive ecclesiastical vernacular literature.[5] Leofric's endowment of his cathedral church of Exeter with sixty books, of which twenty-eight were English, affords some idea of the number then written.[6]

The English scholars seem to have resolutely devoted themselves as a religious duty to the diffusion of such knowledge as they possessed. Though the search after more learning must have been a temptation to such a receptive mind as

[1] *Joannes Glastoniensis, Chronica*, ed. T. Hearne, pp. 423–444.

[2] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Pontificum Anglorum*, ed. N.E.S.A. Hamilton, p. 196.

[3] *Cf.* Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*, ed. W. W. Skeat, vol. ii. p. xlv.

[4] For Peterborough, *cf.* Dugdale, *Monasticon*, i. 382.

[5] H. Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie im XI. und XII. Jahrhundert*, p. 58.

[6] *Dictionary of National Biography* (1046–1072).

that of Ælfric, he evidently thought that his brethren were wrong in not resisting it.[1] It is noticeable, however, that they contributed nothing to the advancement of learning. In theology they pursued the uncritical methods of Bede and Alcuin without any regard for new developments abroad.[2] Their conservatism was so strong that no single instance is known of any scholar like Agobard of Lyons,[3] or Claudius of Turin,[4] who protested against the growth of superstition.

In striking contrast with the contemporary revival in Germany, there was no trace of any opposition in England to the traditional teaching of the Church. The very isolation of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom secluded it from the contact with Oriental heretics, which probably kindled the flame abroad.[5] Indeed the authority of the Fathers, of Bede, and of the Carolingian theologians, was incontestable. In all the writings of Ælfric only one instance of a doubt occurs, in the story of the vengeance of St. Thomas,[6] and in this respect Ælfric was a follower of St. Augustine. He held his peace about the chief source of his 'Lives of the Saints,' the 'Vitæ Patrum,' for fear that it should prove a stumbling-block to others.[7] With the dread of heresy before him, Ælfric translated 'sense for sense'[8] instead of word for word, and he entreated Sigeric, Archbishop of Canterbury (990–994), to correct anything which savoured of error.[9] His views on the Eucharist,[10] which were triumphantly quoted by Protestant writers at the Reformation, were taken directly from the work of Ratramnus, which was not generally recognised as heretical until the controversy between Berengar of Tours

[1] *Homilies of Ælfric*, ed. B. Thorpe, i. 7.
[2] *Cf.* H. Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie*, p. 58.
[3] R. S. Poole, *Illustrations of the History of Mediæval Thought*, pp. 38–46.
[4] *Ibid.* pp. 30–39.
[5] *Ibid.* pp. 90, 91.
[6] *Homilies of Ælfric*, ed. B. Thorpe, ii. 521.
[7] Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*, ed. W. W. Skeat, i. 4.
[8] *Homilies of Ælfric*, ed. B. Thorpe, i. 1.
[9] *Ibid.* p. 3.
[10] *Ibid.* ii. 263–287.

and Lanfranc.[1] Ælfric ignored the speculative interest of the doctrine of predestination which in the middle of the ninth century had divided French scholars into two camps.[2] As a follower of the teaching of Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mainz, he regarded only the dangerous tendencies of the extreme views set forth by Gottschalk.[3]

There was no general belief in England that the world would come to an end in the year 1000.[4] It is possible, however, that there was some discussion of the subject; for in 971 the writer of one of the Blickling Homilies insisted that the time of the second coming of the Saviour was withheld from the knowledge of men.[5] He[6] and others too naturally expressed the current medieval belief that the day of doom was drawing nigh, and saw in the events of their own day the realisation of Christ's prophecies.

The patriotism and public spirit pervading the English monasteries generated that keen interest in historical study which manifested itself in the vigorous and detailed continuations of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle at Abingdon, Worcester, Peterborough, and elsewhere, and in a series of contemporary ecclesiastical biographies from which we derive the greater part of our knowledge of the reigns of Edgar and his sons. The monastic authors before the Norman Conquest were providing materials for a later school of historical writers, but at the same time it is interesting to note that the one attempt at a general history was the chronicle of the ealdorman Ethelweard,[7] a layman and a friend of Ælfric.

No improvement in the Latin style of English writers resulted from the revival of learning in the monasteries. As none of the writings of Dunstan are extant, his style cannot

[1] H. Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie*, p. 61, n. 4.

[2] R. L. Poole, *Illustrations of the History of Mediæval Thought*, p. 51.

[3] Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*, ed. W. W. Skeat, i. 379–383.

[4] *Cf.* H. Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, i. 31, and *American Historical Review*, 1901, pp. 429–439.

[5] *The Blickling Homilies*, ed. R. Morris, Part I. p. 118.

[6] *Ibid.* pp. 106, 116.

[7] *Scriptores Rerum Anglicarum post Bedam*, ed. H. Saville, pp. 473–483

be justly estimated; yet if it differed greatly from that of his contemporaries it would be singular that none of his pupils should show any traces of his influence.[1] Ethelwold's style was marked by obscurity and the frequent use of Greek words.[2] Ælfric alone escaped. Doubtless his constant aim to write plain English gave his Latin style the qualities of clearness and simplicity. William of Malmesbury's comment on the false canons of style of præ-Norman monastic writers is worthy of observation. 'They are importunate judges,' he said, 'who are ignorant that methods of expression vary according to the customs of nations. In a word, the Greeks write "involute," the Romans "splendide," the English "pompatice."'[3]

An attempt to fathom the mind of the people, and to note the effect of such education and teaching as they received through the influence of the Church, is of some interest. The manifold denunciations in sermons of the sin of witchcraft[4] bear witness to a strong belief in heathen superstitions. The stories of St. Dunstan and his several conflicts with the devil[5] merely illustrate the universal belief in the power and material presence of Satan and his army of evil spirits.[6] Under pressure of the Church laws were passed against sorcerers and magicians, but their frequent recurrence showed the prevalence of the practice of divination.[7] The Church, however, only gave the people other superstitions in exchange.

[1] *Cf.* the collection of letters in appendix to *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, *e.g.* pp. 361, 399.

[2] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vol. i. pp. xxvii–xlv. For the authorship of the 'Concordia Regularis' cf. *Ælfric's Abridgment of St. Ethelwold's Concordia Regularis*, ed. M. Bateson, an appendix to *Compotus Rolls of the Obedientiarics of St. Swithun's*, ed. G. W. Kitchin, p. 175.

[3] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Pontificum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, p. 344.

[4] Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*, ed. W. W. Skeat, i. 371. Cf. *The Blickling Homilies*, ed. R. Morris, Part I. p. 60.

[5] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W Stubbs, pp. 26, 27.

[6] *Cf.* W. H. Lecky, *History of the Rise of Rationalism*, i. 37, 38, ed. 1887.

[7] Wilkins, *Concilia*, i. 206, 'De Veneficiis' at the Council of Greatanlea in 928, p. 287, 'Ut sagæ, incantatores etc. exulent' at Council of Eynsham in 1009, p. 306, in 'Leges Ecclesiasticæ Canuti Regis.'

The use of the sign of the cross was recommended as an infallible remedy against demons;[1] the talisman was consecrated by the Church, not forbidden.[2] The growth of relic worship was fostered by the monastic revival.[3] At first it seems to have been due to extreme reverence for the saints, but even then it led to conflicts between monasteries.[4]

Another side of the intellectual influence of English monasticism before the Norman Conquest is to be seen in the political ideal set before the nation. In this respect, too, there is a remarkable contrast with the developments generated by the Cluniac movement on the Continent. The theories of the autonomy of the Church within the State, of the independence of monasticism within the Church, of the world supremacy of the Pope, were unknown in England. In the absence of any speculative discussion of political theory it is only possible to deduce it from the consistent policy of Dunstan and his successors. As the English bishops were almost invariably monks until Canute began the practice of appointing clerks of the Royal Chapel, the influence of the Church may fairly be called monastic.

The ecclesiastical independence of the English Church was very conspicuous. Though from the tenth century the archbishops went to Rome to fetch their palls, it was at first the continuance of a traditional custom rather than the expression of definite subjection to the Papal See. As Dunstan received his pall from so infamous a pope as John XII.,[5] it is not surprising to find that he disregarded a papal dispensation in a matrimonial case, and succeeded in forcing his own view on both Edgar and the recalcitrant noble.[6] In questions of Church organisation expediency

[1] *The Blickling Homilies*, ed. R. Morris, Part I. p. 46, and Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*, ed. W. W. Skeat, ii. 371.

[2] *The Blickling Homilies*, ed. R. Morris, Part I. p. 126.

[3] *E.g.* the translation of St. Swithun by Athelwold, Bishop of Winchester.

[4] *Chronicon Abbatiæ Rameseiensis*, ed. W. D. Macray, pp. 127, 128, and *Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*, ed. J. Stevenson, ii. 280.

[5] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, p. 296.

[6] *Ibid.* pp. 67, 106, 200, 301.

triumphed over papal decrees; Oswald and his successors held the sees of Worcester and York jointly without any sanction of the Papacy. Although the older collections of canons were not unknown,[1] English ecclesiastical law was far more national than that of the Continent.[2] No single mention of the Papacy occurred in the canons of Edgar or Ælfric, or at the Council of Eynsham; only one in the laws of Æthelred,[3] which was merely repeated in the laws of Canute.[4] The feast days of St. Dunstan and St. Edmund were decreed by the Witan.[5]

The legislation of the Witan illustrated the powerful influence of the bishops. Their ideal was an independent theocratic State, a strong united kingdom.[6] Within this State the power of the Church should be more and more direct, the secular laws should be inspired by the ethical spirit of Christianity, the State should co-operate with the Church in the appointment of bishops and abbots[7] and in the making of ecclesiastical laws.[8] It was a practical ideal, and the laws of Edgar, Æthelred, and Canute show how far it was attained; but the close interdependence of Church and State involved the decline of one with the other.

III

'Zeal for letters and religion had grown cold many years before the coming of the Normans.'[9] The frequent and terrible ravages of the Danes recorded in the pages of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle from 980 to 1016 proved fatal to the revival of monasticism; it was impossible for learning

[1] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, p. cxii.

[2] Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie*, p. 45. *Cf.* Wilkins, *Concilia*, i. 225–239, 245, 250–255, 286–292, 295, 296, 299–305.

[3] *Ancient Laws and Institutes of England*, ed. B. Thorpe, p. 147, Æthelred, ix. 26.

[4] Wilkins, *Concilia*, i. 307, cap. x.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 303, cap. xvii.

[6] *Cf.* Ælfric's *Lives of the Saints*, ed. W. W. Skeat, i. 4.

[7] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vol. i. p. xxviii. For several instances *cf.* Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, *e.g.* in 1043.

[8] W. Stubbs, *Constitutional History*, i. 263.

[9] William of Malmesbury, *De Gestis Regum Anglorum*, ed. W. Stubbs, ii. 304.

to flourish among men who lived in daily fear of the coming of the pirate host. When Canute had established peace and restored the monasteries which had suffered in the struggle, the older generation had passed away and their successors did not attain their level. Abbot Leofsin (1029–1045) of Ely set much store by learning,[1] but elsewhere, apparently, there was a general decline. In 1066 it was too early to see any real results of Edward the Confessor's attempts to draw the Church into closer relations with the Papacy[2] and to rekindle the desire for a stricter life by the introduction of foreign abbots and monks.[3] The flourishing state of the Church in Normandy[4] and the conspicuous learning alike of monasteries and cathedrals justified the scorn of the Normans for the intellectual condition of the conquered nation. The difference between the two standards is aptly illustrated in the case of Wulstan, Bishop of Worcester (1062–1095). Though educated within the monasteries of Evesham and Peterborough, and at Worcester schoolmaster, prior, bishop in succession,[5] in 1078 he was threatened with deposition by Lanfranc on the charge of ignorance: he neither knew nor cared to know 'the fables of the poets and the tortuous syllogisms of dialecticians.'[6]

William's policy of substituting Norman rulers in English bishoprics and abbeys was purely political, but through Lanfranc's aid it was destined to raise the intellectual condition of the monasteries. The men who succeeded the English abbots were chosen for their religion and learning

[1] *Liber Eliensis*, ed. D. J. Stewart, p. 200.

[2] E.g. *Chronicon Abbatiæ Rameseiensis*, ed. W. D. Macray, p. 170, Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. 690.

[3] *Lives of Edward the Confessor*, ed. H. R. Luard, p. 414; *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, ed. T. Arnold, i. 56; *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, vol. i. p. lii.

[4] H. Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie*, pp. 3–42.

[5] Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*, ii. 244–249, 'Willelmus Malmesbiriensis de Vita S. Wlstani Episcopi Wigornensis.'

[6] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Pontificum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, p. 279.

from the great Norman houses:[1] Paul of St. Albans (1077–1097)[2] came from Caen, Godfrey of Malmesbury (1081–1105)[3] from Jumièges, Scotland of St. Augustine's (1070–1087) from Mont St. Michel.[4] So rapid was the process that although thirteen out of twenty-one abbots who signed the decrees of the Council of London in 1075 were English, only three still held office at the accession of William Rufus.[5] At the same time there was a great increase in the number of monastic foundations in England. Between 1066 and 1135 three monastic cathedrals, thirteen important monasteries for women, eleven for men, seventeen Cluniac priories, sixty cells for foreign houses, besides many for English houses, were founded.[6] These provided for a large number of Norman abbots and monks; *e.g.* the first monks of Battle came from Marmoutier,[7] those of St. Pancras at Lewes with their Prior Lanzo from Cluny.[8] As life in the Norman monasteries was everywhere more or less modelled on that of Cluny, the Norman abbots of English Benedictine houses, like Paul of St. Albans,[9] very readily accepted the constitutions which Lanfranc drew up for his own cathedral monastery as the type of Benedictine observance. A study of the customs of Cluny[10] shows that Lanfranc drew his constitutions[11] from them, and also throws much light upon subjects familiar enough to his contemporaries, but somewhat obscure to-day. It may be that they served the same purpose then as now, for there was a copy of the Customs of Cluny at Glastonbury in 1247.[12]

[1] For a very full list *cf.* H. Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie*, pp. 107, 108, notes.

[2] *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani*, ed. H. T. Riley, i. 52.

[3] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Pontificum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, p. 279.

[4] Ordericus Vitalis, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. Le Prévost, ii. 209.

[5] H. Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie*, p. 107.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 113, n. 1. [7] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, iii. 233. [8] *Ibid.* p. 1.

[9] *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani*, ed. H. T. Riley, i. 52.

[10] D'Achery, *Spicilegium*, iv. 4–226.

[11] Wilkins, *Concilia*, i. 328–361.

[12] *Joannes Glastoniensis*, *Chronica*, ed. T. Hearne, p. 435.

Under the rule of Abbot Hugh (1048–1108) Cluny was at the real zenith of its greatness; its most famous son, Hildebrand, sat in the chair of St. Peter (1073–1080). A special feature of life at Cluny was the substitution of an extra time for study for the daily manual labour prescribed in the Rule of St. Benedict, or the inclusion of writing under that head.[1] The obligation was considered fulfilled by an occasional day given to manual labour by the abbot and the whole convent, when beans required to be stripped of their leaves, or there was much weeding to be done.[2] The same system was adopted by Lanfranc, and prevailed in England.[3] There is no trace of any compulsory daily manual labour in the extant customs of Benedictine houses; the various officers had servants under them who carried out their commands.

William of Malmesbury held that without a revival of learning other monastic reforms were vain,[4] and all records show that he only expressed the general opinion of his contemporaries, more tersely put in another oft-quoted saying, 'Claustrum sine armario castrum sine armamentario.'[5] Accordingly the first care of the Norman abbots was to increase the libraries. At St. Albans Abbot Paul assigned the tithes of Hatfield and Redbourn for the writing of books and built a scriptorium in which hired writers copied the manuscripts lent him by Lanfranc.[6] The scriptorium continued a special object of interest to his successors.[7] Simon de Gorham (1167–1183) instituted the custom that the abbot should always maintain one writer at his own expense.[8] The list of the books written by his orders was too long for the chronicler to set down.[9] Until the thirteenth

[1] *Cf.* Pignot, *Histoire de l'Ordre de Cluny*, iii. 411; S. Maitland, *The Dark Ages*, pp. 375, 389, 390.

[2] D'Achery, *Spicilegium*, iv. 78–80. [3] Wilkins, *Concilia*, i. 328–361.

[4] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Pontificum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, p. 249.

[5] Martène et Durand, *Thesaurus Anecdotorum*, i. 511.

[6] *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani*, ed. H. T. Riley, i. 57.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 76. [8] *Ibid.* p. 192. [9] *Ibid.* p. 184.

century, indeed, St. Albans was fortunate in a succession of learned abbots. Geoffrey of Maine (1119–1146) was summoned from over the sea to take charge of the grammar school connected with the monastery,[1] Warin (1183–1195) was a master of the University of Salerno,[2] John de Cella (1195–1214) a master of Paris, 'in Grammar esteemed a Priscian, in Verse an Ovid, in Physic a Galen.' [3]

At Malmesbury Abbot Godfrey (1081–1105) devoted himself to the formation of a library in which William of Malmesbury was privileged to be his assistant. He found the monks able only to stammer the vulgar tongue and totally ignorant. Under his rule the learning of the monastery equalled any other in England and surpassed many.[4] As William of Malmesbury was educated from early years within the monastery, the books used by him afford some idea of the extent of the library.[5] Under John of Tours, Bishop of Bath (1088–1123), a physician skilled not only in knowledge but by practice, the 'dull and barbarous' monks of Bath became renowned for learning.[6] William of Malmesbury described the monastery of Thorney as 'divinorum philosophorum gimnasia.' [7] At Abingdon Abbot Faricius (1100–1117) opened a scriptorium in which hired writers produced books for the library; many treatises on medicine were included among them.[8] Evidences of other monastic libraries and of endowments of scriptoria might be multiplied.

A comparative collection of extant library catalogues would throw much light on the state of learning within the

[1] *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani*, ed. H. T. Riley, p. 73.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 194. [3] *Ibid.* p. 217.
[4] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Pontificum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, p. 431.
[5] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Regum*, ed. W. Stubbs, vol. i. pp. xx–xxii.
[6] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Pontificum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, p. 194. He left his whole library to the monks of Bath. *Cf.* Dugdale, *Monasticon*, ii. 268.
[7] *De Gestis Pontificum*, p. 327.
[8] *Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*, ed. J. Stevenson, ii. 44, 289.

monasteries until the end of the twelfth century.[1] These[2] show that the chief study was theology, both positive and contemplative. Notable works of contemporaries were rapidly acquired. Anselm's 'Cur Deus Homo' was a usual possession; both Durham and Rochester had a copy of Gilbert de la Porrée's 'Commentary on the Psalter;' the 'Sermons of St. Bernard' were at Peterborough, at Durham, and, in 1150, at Whitby; the 'Meditations of St. Anselm' at Peterborough and Durham. Great importance was attached to a knowledge of the canon law[3] on account of the number of appeals to Rome. The Decretum of Ivo of Chartres, written about 1115, was found everywhere; the Decretum of Gratian, completed about 1142, at Rochester, Peterborough, and Durham. In the second half of the twelfth century,[4] participation in the vigorous study of Roman law in England was shown at St. Albans[5] and at Peterborough; the latter possessed the 'Institutiones Justiniani cum autenticis et Infortiato,' 'Digestum vetus,' 'Tres partes cum digesto novo,' and 'Totum corpus juris in duobus voluminibus.' The books of the 'Organon,' which were not in circulation until the middle of the twelfth century in Western Europe,[6] were at Rochester in 1202, at Glastonbury in 1247. At Durham and at Rochester there were large collections of books of medicine, and some at least were included in every catalogue. If the use of the books had been confined to the monks, there would not be so much justification for an analysis of

[1] *Historical Introductions to the Rolls Series*, by W. Stubbs, p. 437; H. Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, vol. ii. part ii. p. 476.

[2] For the catalogue of Durham of the first half of the twelfth century cf. *Catalogi Veteres Librorum Ecclesiæ Cathedralis Dunelm.*, pp. 1–10, Surtees Soc.; for the catalogue of Whitby in 1150 *cf.* Charlton, *History of Whitby*, pp. 112–114; for the catalogue of Rochester in 1202 cf. *A Memorial of the Priory at St. Andrew at Rochester*, by W. B. Rye. The list of books written during the rule of Benedict, Abbot of Peterborough (1177–1193), is in Sparke, *Historiæ Anglicanæ Scriptores Varii*, ii. 98. For the catalogue of the Glastonbury library in 1247 cf. *Joannes Glastoniensis, Chronica*, ed. T. Hearne, pp. 423–444.

[3] *Cf.* H. Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, i. 140, 141.

[4] *Ibid.* vol. ii. par. ii. p. 336, n. 2.

[5] *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani*, ed. H. T. Riley, i. 196.

[6] *Cf.* H. Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, i. 61.

the contents of the libraries. The customs of several Benedictine houses, which may fairly be taken to represent the usual practice in the twelfth century, show that books were lent on an adequate security to persons in general.[1] The characteristic unscrupulousness of the book-borrower in all ages necessitated some provision against his abuse of his privileges. At Abingdon the precentor could not sell, give away, or pledge any books;[2] he might only lend one on the deposit of a pledge of equal or greater value than the book itself. Even under these circumstances only neighbouring churches or persons of conspicuous worth might borrow. No doubt experience prompted the writer to add, 'It is safer to fall back on a pledge than to proceed against an individual.' At Eynsham,[3] perhaps, the library had suffered fewer losses. At any rate, for a sum of money books might be lent by the precentor to persons known or unknown, though sometimes the consent of the abbot, prior, or chapter was necessary. In this monastery the precentor might sell books for a price. At Evesham,[4] provided a proper and sufficient voucher was given, any person might borrow.

The lending of books for an equivalent pledge was the general practice among the Augustinian[5] and Præmonstratensian Canons,[6] and therefore the founding before the end of the twelfth century of over a hundred and thirty Augustinian houses, of which many were noted for learning, and of twenty-one Præmonstratensian houses, added largely to the number of public libraries. The Carthusians also lent books,[7] but in England only the monastery at Witham was founded

[1] *Cf.* J. Willis Clark, *The Care of Books*, p. 74 *et seq.*

[2] *Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*, ed. J. Stevenson, ii. 374–8.

[3] MS. Bodley, 435, cap. xv. sect. viii.

[4] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, ii. 39.

[5] *Customs of Augustinian Canons*, ed. J. W. Clark, p. 62, and J. W. Clark, *The Care of Books*, p. 71.

[6] *Statuta primaria Præmonstratensis Ordinis*, cap. vii. p. 803, ap. Le Paige, *Bibliotheca Præm. Ord.* ed. 1633.

[7] *Guigonis Prioris Carthusiæ Statuta*, ed. 1510, *Statuta Antiquæ*, part ii. cap. xvi. 9.

before 1200. There was no provision among the Cistercians,[1] at least in the twelfth century in England, for the lending of books outside the order. Probably at that time their libraries were too small and unimportant to allow of it, but their subsequent growth has been carefully traced through the provision of book-rooms.[2] In this respect too the Gilbertines followed the Cistercians; the rule merely allowed the lending of books to other houses of the same order.[3]

Another purpose served by the library was that of furnishing books for the use of the master of the grammar school connected with the monastery.[4]

At Bec, the model of other Norman monasteries, the school for oblates and monks was entirely distinct from that opened by Lanfranc for the sons of the barons and for clerks.[5] At Cluny, in 1150, a hostel was being maintained at the expense of the monastery for clerks of noble birth, who attended the school in the town,[6] and such schools are known to have been provided by other French Cluniac houses.[7] There can be little doubt that in England the separation of the schools was a feature of the Benedictine revival. Moreover it was in accordance with the general policy of William and Lanfranc, the revival of Church councils for ecclesiastical legislation, the separation of spiritual and temporal courts. Gilbert de Gant, son of the founder of Bridlington, spent his early years within that priory.[8] It is probable that there were isolated instances.

The secular school seems to have been regarded as a necessary adjunct of the Benedictine monastery.[9] Though

[1] P. Guignard, *Les Monuments primitifs de la Règle Cistercienne*, p. 237.

[2] J. W. Clark, *The Care of Books*, pp. 86–89.

[3] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vol. vi. part ii. p. xxxv.

[4] *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani*, ed. H. T. Riley, i. 196.

[5] *Lanfranci Opera Omnia*, ed. Giles, i. 296; cf. *L'Abbaye du Bec et ses Écoles*, par M. L'Abbé Porrée.

[6] Migne, *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*, clxxxix. 1051.

[7] J. H. Pignot, *Histoire de l'Ordre de Cluny*, ii. 414.

[8] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vi. part 1, p. 280.

[9] *Cf.* H. Rashdall, *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, vol. ii. part ii. p. 600, n. 2.

no record of the actual foundation of any one of these schools remains, there is ample evidence of their existence. The relations between the grammar school and the monastery are shown at St. Albans and at Bury St. Edmund's. The master was a secular scholar,[1] chosen by the abbot or some other officer of the monastery. In the three instances known of the appointments at St. Albans, the choice fell upon men of high intellectual attainments. Geoffrey of Maine was summoned from abroad by Richard, the second Norman Abbot (1097–1119).[2] As he did not arrive in time he lost the post, and until it should again fall vacant he became master of the school at Dunstable. Under the rule of Abbot Warin (1183–1195) the mastership of the school was held first by Alexander Neckham,[3] a master of the University of Paris, and afterwards for many years with conspicuous success by the abbot's nephew, Warin, a master of Salerno.[4] As early as 1090 a monk named Hermann, of the newly founded cell of St. Albans at Binham in Norfolk, was in charge of a school there.[5]

Abbot Samson's (1182–1211) endowment of five marks towards the payment of the master,[6] and his provision of free lodgings for scholars attending the grammar school at Bury,[7] were intended to put higher education within the reach of the poorest. Rich and poor alike might live in his hostel, and forty poor boys paid no fee at all for their teaching.[8] His policy was evidently regarded by his biographer as the outcome of his own experience. As a poor clerk he had been indebted to William, master of the school of Diss in Norfolk, for leave to attend without any payment.[9] At the University of Paris he had been supported

[1] *Cf.* H. Rashdall, *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, vol. ii. part ii. p. 600, note 2.

[2] *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani*, ed. H. T. Riley, i. 73.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 196. *Cf.* H. Rashdall, *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, i. 323.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 396.

[5] *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, ed. T. Arnold, i. 77, 78, 145.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 296.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 249.

[8] MS. Harl. 1005, f. 126.

[9] *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, ed. T. Arnold, i. 248.

by a chaplain from the profits of the sale of holy water.[1] On his return to England his precarious existence as a schoolmaster, not even sure of five or six marks a year, led him to become a monk of Bury,[2] and probably for the same reason other schoolmasters[3] too were among the brethren over whom he was abbot. However, the consideration for poor scholars and schoolmasters alike which marked Alexander III.'s decree,[4] issued at the Lateran Council in 1179, warrants a belief that Samson acted upon it. As the decree was certainly promulgated in England[5] and generally known,[6] and the schools at St. Albans and Canterbury[7] were also, to some extent, endowed, it may be assumed that this was the general relationship between the grammar school and the monastery. At a later date there were schools on two other manors belonging to Bury St. Edmund's, at Beccles and at Mildenhall,[8] to which officials of the monastery appointed the master.

Grammar schools were attached to the houses of Augustinian canons except, perhaps, to some which concentrated all their attention on hospitals. In some instances, as at Waltham,[9] at Huntingdon,[10] at Canterbury,[11] and at Christchurch, Twinham,[12] where they took the place of secular canons, they merely continued the schools of their predecessors. At Dunstable Henry I. handed over the schools

[1] *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, p. 247.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 241.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 324.

[4] Labbe, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Collectio*, ed. Cossart, xxii. 227. *Cf.* the Lateran Council of 1215, xxii. 999, cap. xi.

[5] Cf. *Chronica Rogeri de Hoveden*, ed. W. Stubbs, ii. 179, and William of Newburgh, *Historia Rerum Anglicarum*, ed. R. Howlett, i. 219.

[6] Wilkins, *Concilia*, i. 498, 555.

[7] H. Rashdall, *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, vol. ii. part ii. p. 601.

[8] MS. Harl. 1005, f. 102^{v}. Cf. *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, ed. T. Arnold, iii. 182.

[9] *The Foundation of Waltham Abbey*, ed. W. Stubbs, pp. 15, 35.

[10] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vi. part i. p. 79.

[11] H. Böhmer, *Die Fälschungen Erzbischof Lanfrancs von Canterbury*, p. 174; Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vi. part ii. p. 615.

[12] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vi. part i. pp. 304, 305.

of the town to their charge.[1] Alexander Neckham was master there before he went to St. Albans.[2] It was at Merton that Thomas Becket received his early education.[3]

There is no evidence that the Cistercians in the twelfth century made any provision for secular education, nor would this have been consistent with their general policy. They planted their churches in remote and desolate places, far from human habitation; unlike the Benedictines who frequently allowed their naves to be used as parish churches, the Cistercians reserved theirs for their lay brethren.[4] The Gilbertine canons also were forbidden by their founder to teach any boys except novices in any of the double houses of the order.[5] From other evidence, too, it seems probable that a school was attached to the single houses,[6] but before 1200 only four of these existed.

The standard of education in the grammar schools of collegiate churches and of monasteries must have varied greatly. In some instruction was limited to grammar and the rudiments of logic, in others the subjects of higher education were imparted.[7] It may be fairly conjectured that in the schools dependent on the greater monasteries, in which learning steadily increased, the standard rose with the appointment of masters who had studied at the universities of Paris and Salerno, and possibly of Bologna too. However, after the rise of the universities, the education given in grammar schools in their neighbourhood, and probably afterwards elsewhere, would be more or less elementary.[8]

[1] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vi. part i. p. 240.

[2] *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani*, ed. H. T. Riley, i. 196.

[3] *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, ed. J. C. Robertson, iii. 14.

[4] W. H. St. John Hope, *The Abbey of St. Mary in Furness*, pp. 34, 35.

[5] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vol. vi. part i. p. xliii.

[6] There was a master of the schools at Malton in 1245. *Cf.* MS. Laud, 642, f. 3 (Bodleian Library).

[7] *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, ed. J. C. Robertson, vol. iii. p. 4. *Cf.* J. H. Round, *The Commune of London*, p. 117.

[8] H. Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, vol. ii. part ii. pp. 601, 476. *Cf.* Bass Mullinger, *The University of Cambridge from the Earliest Times to* 1535, p. 70.

Although after the Norman Conquest heathen beliefs were not nearly so prevalent, yet no progress was made in the direction of rationalism. The multiplication of miracles which occurred, especially in monastic churches, and the magnifying of their importance by monastic writers promoted the growth of superstition. The scorn of the Normans for English saints [1] was only an expression of their contempt for the subject race, and it rapidly evaporated. In spite of Lanfranc's rationalistic theory as to the nature and object of miracles, set forth in his popular 'Elucidarium sive Dialogus de Summa totius Christianæ Theologiæ,' [2] there was a vast increase in the number recorded throughout this period.[3] An instance of the result of this general belief in miracles is shown in the ease with which, in 1201, some of the country people received two impostors as St. Nicholas and St. Andrew.[4]

There were a number of doctors within the English monasteries. At Bury Hermann related how Herfast, Bishop of Thetford (1070–1086), was cured of an injury to his eye by the skill of Abbot Baldwin (1065–1098) and through the virtue of the bones of St. Edmund.[5] When Baldwin was in Normandy, as physician of William the Conqueror, he had some relic of St. Edmund with him.[6] In the time of Abbot Samson (1182–1211), Master Walter was a renowned doctor, and gained much money for the monastery by his cures.[7] Other instances of monks skilled in the practice of physic might be mentioned, among them

[1] *Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*, ed. J. Stevenson, ii. 284. 'Ad tantum [Abbas Ethelelmus] etiam devolutus est ut prohiberet ne aliqua memoria neque memoratio fieret de sancto Athelwoldo, neque de sancto Edwardo; dixit enim esse Anglicos rusticos nec etiam debere ecclesias quas ibi fundaverunt.' Cf. *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Pontificum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, p. 420; Eadmer, *Historia Novorum*, ed. M. Rule, pp. 350–353.

[2] *Lanfranci Omnia Opera*, ed. J. A. Giles, ii. 264.

[3] *E.g.* the Miracles of St. Thomas of Canterbury, cf. *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, ed. J. C. Robertson, vols. i., ii., iii.; the Miracles of St. Gilbert of Sempringham, *cf.* MS. Cotton, Cleopatra, B. 1, ff. 140ᵛ–168.

[4] *Annales Monastici*, ed. H. R. Luard, ii. 74.

[5] *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, ed. T. Arnold, i. p. 62.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 72.

[7] *Ibid.* pp. 223, 297.

Faricius, Abbot of Abingdon (1100–1117).[1] Towards the end of Henry II.'s reign four English monks of St. Albans were masters of the University of Salerno,[2] which was purely a medical school.[3] In consideration of the close relations between England and the Norman kingdom of Sicily at that time, it is unlikely that they were isolated representatives. However, in accordance with the Rule of St. Benedict, the monk might only use his art for the good of his monastery.[4] The practice of medicine was forbidden, as unbecoming to his profession, by the Lateran Council in 1139,[5] and again in 1179[6] and in 1215.[7]

In spite of much intercourse with the Continent, and with the East at the time of the Crusades, it was the boast of William of Newburgh that the plague of heresy had never infected England. Heresy was rife in France, Germany, Italy, and Spain, but the thirty German Paulicians who landed in England converted only one woman, and she recanted when they were condemned at the Council of Oxford in 1166.[8]

The Norman Conquest gave a great impetus to historical study, already the most intellectually important side of monasticism in England. The cultured Norman abbots and monks were at one with their English brethren in their interest in the history of their own monasteries, of their country, and of the great ecclesiastics of the past. That interest, however, cannot be fairly assessed at the number of historical works written, much less of those remaining to us; the monk could only write at the command of his superiors.[9] The aim of those in authority was to provide some account

[1] *Cf.* p. 24, note 8.

[2] *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani*, ed. H. T. Riley, i. 194–196.

[3] H. Rashdall, *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, i. 77.

[4] *Regula S. Benedicti*, cap. lvii.

[5] Labbe, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Collectio*, ed. Cossart, xxi. 528, cap. ix.

[6] Vol. xxii. p. 373, cap. ii. [7] Vol. xxii. p. 1010, cap. xxii.

[8] *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I.*, ed. R. Howlett, i. 131–134.

[9] *Simeonis Monachi Opera Omnia*, ed. T. Arnold, i. 3 (R.S.); Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*, ii. 123. Cf. *Les Monuments primitifs de la Règle Cistercienne*, ed. Ph. Guignard, p. 266; Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vol. vi. part ii. p. li.

of the history of the monastery, the lives of its special saints and benefactors, and a record of its possessions and privileges. Thus while a monk at Ely, the Norman Goscelin [1] (*c.* 1098?) wrote the Life of St. Ethelreda, at Ramsey that of St. Ivo, and, after he was transferred to Canterbury, the lives of St. Augustine and his first six successors. Hermann of Bury wrote the miracles of St. Edmund at the request of Abbot Baldwin.[2] Folcard, Abbot of Thorney (fl. 1066), composed the lives of St. Adulf, St. Botulf, and St. John of Beverley.[3] At Canterbury an Englishman, Osbern the precentor (fl. 1090), wrote the lives of St. Dunstan [4] and St. Elphege [5] by Lanfranc's wish. His successor and fellow countryman Eadmer added another life of St. Dunstan [6] and lives of Odo,[7] St. Wilfrid,[8] and, at the urgent request of the monks of Worcester, the life of St. Oswald.[9] Though the special object of the Norman writers was to increase the fame of their monasteries, yet the Anglo-Saxon motive for compiling lives of the saints was not absent from some of them. Eadmer [10] and Gervase of Canterbury [11] alike regarded them as instructive to the greater number of men, who learnt more easily from example than from precept.

The Normans continued the practice of chronicling monastic and national events, but they used the Latin language; at Peterborough alone after 1075, and only until 1154, the chronicle was continued in Anglo-Saxon.[12] In the course of the twelfth century most of the Benedictine monasteries appear to have kept chronicles. The provenance

[1] *Descriptive Catalogue of Materials*, ed. T. D. Hardy, ii. 82, 83 (R.S.)
[2] *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, ed. T. Arnold, i. 26–92.
[3] *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, vol. i. p. lii, pp. 240–260.
[4] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, pp. 69–161.
[5] Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*, ii. 123–147.
[6] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, 161–249.
[7] Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*, ii. 78–87.
[8] *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, i. 161–226.
[9] *Ibid.* ii. 1–59.
[10] *Ibid.* ii. 42.
[11] Cf. *Gervasii Monachi Cantuariensis Opera Historica*, ed. W. Stubbs, i. 86 (R.S.)
[12] *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, ed. B. Thorpe, ii. 235.

of some of these is difficult to trace, for the chronicle of one monastery was incorporated into that of another without any acknowledgment, and interpolations were freely made.[1] However for local events they were and are first-hand authorities of great value, and for national history they proved faithful reproductions of independent authorities. In his prologue to his own Chronicle Gervase of Canterbury (fl. 1188) noted the various nature of these compilations and condemned some of the writers who strayed into the province of the historian.[2] Some chroniclers, like Florence of Worcester (d. 1118),[3] were chiefly concerned with national history; others, again, like the chroniclers of Ramsey[4] and Abingdon[5] and Thomas of Ely,[6] found their chief sources in their own monastic archives, and used general history only as a setting for local events.

As contemporary historians also the monks were greatly distinguished. Most of the ecclesiastical biographies were their work. Milo Crispin,[7] a monk of Westminster, wrote the life of Lanfranc, Eadmer[8] that of Anselm; Coleman, a monk of Worcester, produced an Anglo-Saxon life of Wulstan, from which William of Malmesbury drew his materials;[9] several of the Canterbury monks[10] contributed lives of Thomas Becket; Jocelin of Brakelond[11] was the biographer of Abbot Samson of Bury; the official life of

[1] Cf. *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi Benedicti Abbatis*, ed. W. Stubbs, vol. i. p. xi.

[2] *Gervasii Monachi Cantuariensis Opera Historica*, ed. W. Stubbs, i. 87.

[3] Florence of Worcester, *Chronicon ex Chronicis*, ed. B. Thorpe, English Historical Society.

[4] *Chronicon Abbatiæ Rameseiensis*, ed. W. D. Macray.

[5] *Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*, ed. J. Stevenson.

[6] *Liber Eliensis*, ed. D. J. Stewart, Anglia Christiana Society.

[7] *Beati Lanfranci Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis Opera Omnia*, ed. J. A. Giles, i. 281–313.

[8] *Eadmeri Opuscula duo de Vita S. Anselmi*, ed. M. Rule, pp. 305–424.

[9] Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*, ii. 244–249.

[10] *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, ed. J. C. Robertson, i., ii. 1–279, 299–323.

[11] *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, ed. T. Arnold, i. 209–336.

St. Gilbert was the work of one of his canons.[1] The monks had a high conception of the worth of their historical studies. Eadmer wrote the story of the struggles of Anselm with William II. and Henry I. to afford precedents for future generations ;[2] William of Malmesbury deemed it shameful to be ignorant of the history of England,[3] and showed a due appreciation of the connection between literature and politics ;[4] the Augustinian canon, William of Newburgh, wrote to increase knowledge and to warn posterity by the lessons of history.[5]

The increasing popularity of history, so apparent in the reign of Henry II., was due in great part to the influence of the numerous historical works produced in the monasteries and to their teaching of the value of precedent. In the monastic libraries Henry of Huntingdon, Ralph de Diceto, Roger Hoveden, and others found the requisite materials for the earlier portions of their work. Moreover subsequent historical writers might learn from the greatest monastic historians the function of criticism, a philosophic judgment, and the most fitting style. The new methods of historical writing adopted by monastic authors after the Norman Conquest were the outcome of the use of dialectic in theology and philosophy by Lanfranc, Anselm, and their pupils. Lanfranc taught a right use of authorities ; Anselm, as William of Malmesbury noted, the justification of authority by reason.[6] Indeed, many of the canons of modern historical teaching are duly set forth in the pages of William of Malmesbury and William of Newburgh. Both carefully weighed their authorities. Internal evidence proved the

[1] MS. Cotton, Cleopatra, B 1, ff. 33–168.

[2] *Eadmeri Historia Novorum in Anglia*, ed. M. Rule, p. 1 (R.S.)

[3] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Pontificum Anglorum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, p. 4.

[4] William of Malmesbury, *De Gestis Regum Anglorum*, ed. W. Stubbs, ii. 467.

[5] *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I.*, ed. R. Howlett, i. 3.

[6] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Pontificum Anglorum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, p. 76.

veracity of Gildas and Bede to William of Newburgh,[1] while a skilful analysis of the contents of the 'Historia Britonum,' a comparison with other authorities, and an appeal to reason resulted in his rejection of Geoffrey of Monmouth.[2] After delving in the aumbry at Glastonbury and reading all the works on St. Dunstan, both Latin and English, William of Malmesbury recognised the general harmony of older writers.[3] He considered that Osbern's work was discredited by ignorance of the antiquities of Glastonbury, but as many books were burnt in the fire at Canterbury in 1070 there was some excuse for him.[4] Ignorance of Anglo-Saxon prevented Faricius, Abbot of Abingdon, from writing an adequate life of St. Aldhelm, and the fame attained by Faricius in other fields ought not to prejudice readers of William of Malmesbury's rival life.[5] In writing of contemporary events William of Newburgh showed equal care and judgment in sifting evidence. For his account of the death of William, Archbishop of York, in 1154, he sought the testimony of several witnesses and obtained an independent opinion from doctors.[6] He had the courage to record prodigies which were told him by absolutely reliable witnesses, and moreover, unlike most of his contemporaries, the wisdom to refrain from putting his own interpretation upon them, regarding them as beyond his understanding.[7]

There was a general belief among the monks that style had a dangerous influence on the popular mind. William of Newburgh urged that it was no criterion of historical

[1] *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I.*, ed. R. Howlett, i. 11, 18.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 11–18.

[3] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, p. 289.

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 251–253.

[5] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Pontificum Anglorum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, pp. 330, 331.

[6] *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I.*, ed. R. Howlett, i. 80, 81.

[7] *Ibid.* pp. 84, 308.

accuracy, for Gildas wrote execrably,[1] Geoffrey of Monmouth with marvellous fascination.[2] William of Malmesbury justified his life of St. Dunstan on the ground that the older writers lacked grace and therefore remained unread,[3] while Osbern, on the other hand, had used rhetoric to cover his lack of truth.[4] Samson of Bury took up his pen to rewrite the miracles of St. Edmund in a sober style.[5] Richard of Ely shrank from the use of rhetoric.[6] The general use of Latin instead of the vernacular for literary purposes after the Norman Conquest resulted in the speedy development of a distinctly good style. Osbern of Canterbury, Hermann of Bury,[7] and Senatus Bravonius[8] of Worcester clung to old traditions, and derived their somewhat turgid language from their slavish imitation of the Vulgate. The succeeding generations profited by the revival of classical study, and wrote grammatical Latin which, though somewhat free, was yet a living language. The graceful style of Eadmer, the forcible simplicity of William of Malmesbury, and the neatly finished periods of William of Newburgh were admirable models.

The influence of monasticism on the evolution of political theory in England was very considerable. The slow acceptance of the Hildebrandine conceptions of the Papacy, and of the ensuing relations between Church and State, was in great measure due to the fact that the Benedictine monasteries entirely abstained from propagating them. Owing to the circumstances of the monastic revival, the political ideas emanating from Cluny, and most forcibly expressed by Gregory VII., gained no adherents in England. As in

[1] *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I.*, ed. R. Howlett, i. 11.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 12.
[3] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, p. 250.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 288.
[5] *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, ed. T. Arnold, i. 107.
[6] *Liber Eliensis*, ed. D. J. Stewart, p. 94.
[7] *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, ed. T. Arnold, i. 26–92.
[8] *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, ii. 60–97.

Normandy, the monasteries accepted the reformed life of Cluny without adopting the hierarchical government of that order; moreover in 1135 there were only seventeen Cluniac houses in England, and all of them were alien priories. Accordingly the Benedictine monks took no exception to the claims of William I. and William II.[1] to decide whether pope or antipope should be recognised, and the acknowledgment of no pope in England for ten years after the death of Gregory VII. was not a stumbling-block to them.[2] Florence of Worcester[3] and William of Malmesbury[4] alike chronicled with remarkable indifference the existence of rival popes.

In his adhesion to Urban II. Anselm stood practically alone against the King, barons, bishops, and abbots. His uncompromising enunciation of the Hildebrandine theory at the Council of Rockingham in 1095 filled his hearers with horror and confusion.[5] Though many of the bishops then had been servants of the Crown, all the abbots[6] present united with them against Anselm. They made no attempt to set forth any opposing theory, but in advising unqualified submission to the King they showed their belief in the independence of the National Church.[7] In spite of their personal sympathy with Anselm, even the monks of his own cathedral did not understand his views on papal autocracy.[8] The principles involved in the investiture struggle excited no passionate feelings in monastic writers; the general ecclesiastical attitude is represented in the comment made by Hugh, the Chanter of York, on the futility of the points at issue.[9] In the strife between successive Archbishops of York

[1] *Eadmeri Historia Novorum in Anglia*, ed. M. Rule, p. 52. [2] *Ibid.*

[3] Florence of Worcester, *Chronicon ex Chronicis*, ed. B. Thorpe, ii. 29, 99.

[4] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Regum*, ed. W. Stubbs, ii. 498, and *De Gestis Pontificum Anglorum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, p. 85.

[5] *Eadmeri Historia Novorum in Anglia*, ed. M. Rule, p. 57.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 63. [7] *Ibid.* pp. 58–63.

[8] 'Epistolarum Sancti Anselmi' lib. iii. No. C; Migne, *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*, clix. 138.

[9] *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, ii. 110: 'Sed si fas est dici, adhuc habet ecclesia decimantes mentam et anethum, et colantes culicem et

and Canterbury over the profession of obedience demanded by the Mother Church, each party in turn appealed to Rome as a political move.[1] If the result was successful the authority of the Pope was triumphantly quoted, but both parties denied his right to exercise any authority when the judgment was unfavourable to them. A conspicuous consensus of opinion is to be seen from a comparison between the anonymous treatise composed by a secular canon of York shortly after 1104,[2] and the letter to Calixtus II. in 1119 from Ralph, Archbishop of Canterbury,[3] written with the aid of the Christchurch monks. Both based the claims of their respective sees on the authority of ancient documents; both reminded the Pope that he could not change the decrees of his predecessors.[4] Both struck at the roots of the hierarchical claims of the Papacy by denying the power of the Pope to alter the relations between one Church and another,[5]

deglutientes camelum, de manuali investitura tumultuantes, de electionis et consecrationis libertate nihil mutientes.'

[1] *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, ii. 98–220.

[2] Printed for the first time as an appendix to *Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie im XI. und XII. Jahrhundert*, by H. Böhmer, pp. 436–497.

[3] *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, ii. 228–258.

[4] H. Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat*, p. 480: 'Hoc itaque decretum inter eos ordinavit beatus Gregorius et hoc reverenter exsecutus est beatus Augustinus, nec legitur quod alter ab altero consecratus sit vel professionem fecerit. Hoc, inquam, decretum nulli unquam mutare vel destruere jure licuit, nec etiam apostolicæ sedi. Sicut dicit papa Zozimus scribens Narbonensibus: "Contra statuta patrum aliquid concedere vel mutare, nec huius sanctæ sedis potest auctoritas." Apud nos enim inconvulsis radicibus vivit antiquitas, cui sancti patres sanxere reverentiam.' Cf. *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, ii. 248: 'Solent enim Romani pontifices de observandis indeclinabiliter decretis antecessorum suorum ante consecrationem suam profiteri, et mihi quisquam audeat imponere quatinus ecclesiæ meæ privilegia debeam evacuare? Quod si forte alicuius occasionis tantum nefas presumam attingere, certum est quod spiritalis reus adulterii quia primam fidem irritam feci. Hinc profecto beatus Gregorius scribit ita: "Grave nimis," inquit, "et contra sacerdotale constat esse propositum velle cuiusquam ecclesiæ privilegia olim indulta confundere." Quod autem nec ipsi summo pontifici liceat sanctorum patrum traditionibus contraire Zosimus papa sic testatur: "Contra statuta," inquit, "patrum aliquid concedere vel mutare, nec huius quidem sedis potest auctoritas."'

[5] H. Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat*, pp. 437–452, *e.g.* p. 445. 'Non tamen Romanos pontifices dampnare volumus, set Christum et apostolos suos ipsis præferimus, et ordinis unitatem dividere et dignitatem episcopalem in aliquo minuere

by insisting on the fallible nature of his judgment,[1] by questioning his right to summon bishops to his court.[2]

In the second half of the twelfth century the spread of the new monastic orders in England was an important factor in the altered relations between Church and State. The Cistercians recognised the interference of no bishop save the Pope; they were under his special protection, and therefore upheld his authority over that of any national ruler, and their organisation was cosmopolitan. In the disputed succession to the see of York in 1143[3] their appeals to a Cistercian pope, Eugenius III., resulted in the instalment of their own candidate, Henry Murdac, Abbot of Fountains, to the discomfiture of King Stephen and Henry, Bishop of Winchester.

The influence of the Cistercian teaching over an order composed of English men and women, and founded in England between 1131 and 1139, was illustrated in the attitude of the Gilbertines in the conflict between Becket and Henry II. When Becket fled from the Council of Northampton in 1164 they aided his escape from England

nolumus. . . . Verbi gratia: ut est illa sententia Gelasii papæ, quæ dicit: "Illud etiam adnecti placuit, ut facultates ecclesiæ et dioceses, quæ ab aliquibus possidentur episcopis, jure sibi vendicent, quod tricennalis lex conclusit, quia et ultra triginta annos nulli liceat pro eo appellare, quod legum tempus excludit."' Cf. *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, ii. 249: 'Et quidem in sæcularibus judiciis solent minores potestates cum suis inferioribus quæcunque inter se discrepare videntur, in sua curia tractare nec ante majoris potestatis curiæ præsentari, quam justitiæ veritatem in sua deprehendantur violasse, nec judicatur ibi debere quemquam subire judicium donec investiatur, unde sine judicio passus est spoliari. Qua in re nec sacri canones dissentire videntur, qui etiam ad veritatis diffinitionem triginta vel quadraginta annorum investituram in rebus ecclesiasticis satis esse testantur.'

[1] H. Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat*, p. 436: 'Secundum summi pontificis personam super omnes homines est, secundum hominis personam inter homines, secundum peccatoris personam infra homines.' Cf. *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, ii. 250: 'Quocirca viderit sanctæ sedis Apostolicæ summa justitia, si spoliari debet per surreptionem unius hominis quod potuit haberi per spatium tanti temporis.'

[2] H. Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat*, p. 246; *Historians of the Church of York*, ii. 251.

[3] *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I.*, ed. R. Howlett, i. 56.

by passing him from house to house of their order.[1] Though falsely charged before the King's justices in 1165 with having sent money abroad to Becket, Gilbert of Sempringham replied that he would rather suffer exile than swear to his innocence. As a loyal son of the Church he would have thought it right to help the Archbishop in every way he could, and his oath, therefore, might be misunderstood.[2]

Though the Benedictines showed jealousy of the new monastic orders which were robbing them of their popularity, they became rapidly imbued with the political ideals of their rivals. The Crown had failed to protect them from outrage in the troublous years of Stephen's reign, the new orders enjoyed freedom of election and immunity from financial and other burdens. Accordingly the great Benedictine houses sought the same privileges from the Papacy,[3] and in some instances even they forged bulls of early date.[4] The acceptance of the Pope as supreme protector involved the adoption of the Hildebrandine theories, and the claims made by Becket on behalf of the Church found favour with all his monastic biographers.

This change of attitude is very visible in the quarrel between the Canterbury monks and Baldwin, the Cistercian Archbishop (1185–1193). The monastic party in England was divided,[5] but each side regarded the Pope as supreme arbiter and finally bowed to his judgment. In the twelfth century popular regard and the consent of the bishops and the Crown

[1] *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, ed. J. C. Robertson, iii. 323–325, iv. 44–55.

[2] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vol. vi. part ii. p. xvii.

[3] *E.g.* the following sought papal protection :—St. Augustine's, Canterbury, in 1139, Jaffé, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, ed. 1885, No. 8004; Malmesbury, in 1151, *ibid.* No. 9466; Sherborne, in 1146, *ibid.* No. 8855; Rochester, in 1146, *ibid.* No. 8870; Westminster, in 1146, *ibid.* No. 8878; Peterborough, in 1146, *ibid.* No. 8965; Abingdon, in 1152, *ibid.* No. 9567. Malmesbury and Peterborough also obtained privileges of election and exemption from episcopal jurisdiction. *Cf.* Jaffé, No. 9466, *Registrum Malmesbiriense*, ed. J. S. Brewer, i. 346, 348.

[4] *Chronicon Abbatiæ Rameseiensis*, ed. W. D. Macray, pp. 99, 176.

[5] *Chronicles and Memorials of the Reign of Richard I.*, vol. ii. p. xliii.

no longer sufficed to create an English saint. A decree of canonisation was sought for Edward the Confessor from Alexander III. in 1161,[1] for Gilbert of Sempringham from Innocent III. in 1202.[2]

Towards the end of the twelfth century intolerance of the Jews was steadily increasing in spite of the favour with which they were regarded by the Crown. In accordance with successive decrees of Lateran Councils,[3] the friendly feelings manifested by St. Anselm and Gilbert Crispin,[4] Abbot of Westminster, gave place to bitter enmity. Three important Benedictine monasteries lent currency to the blood accusation by burying the martyrs within their churches, and kept the stories before the minds of the people by recording miracles worked by St. William of Norwich,[5] St. Harold of Gloucester,[6] and St. Robert of Bury.[7] In the Rochester library, in 1202, there were three books against the Jews,[8] and another was included in the Reading catalogue in the middle of the thirteenth century.[9] Thus the Benedictines furnished an intellectual justification for the hostility of the towns to the privileged aliens in their midst, of the impoverished lesser barons, and of the Cistercians, who owed nine of their northern houses to the money of Aaron of Lincoln.[10] Even William of Newburgh regarded the massacres of the Jews in 1189 as the direct working of the Divine Providence.[11]

[1] Wilkins, *Concilia*, i. 434.

[2] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vol. vi. part ii. p. xxv.

[3] Labbe, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Collectio*, ed. Cossart, p. 231.

[4] 'De Fide Ecclesiæ contra Judeos,' addressed to Anselm by Gilbert Crispin; Migne, *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*, clix. 1063.

[5] Martyred in 1144; cf. *The Jews of Angevin England*, ed. J. Jacobs, p. 19.

[6] Martyred in 1168; cf. *ibid.* p. 45.

[7] Martyred in 1181; cf. *ibid.* p. 75.

[8] 'Arma contra Judeos,' 'Magister Andrea contra Judeos,' '[Liber] qui vocatur Bartholomeus contra Judeos;' *cf.* W. B. Rye, *A Memorial of the Priory of St. Andrew at Rochester.*

[9] 'Petrus Aleunei contra Judeos;' *cf.* Supplement to Coates, *History of Reading*, ed. 1802.

[10] *Jewish Quarterly*, July 1898.

[11] *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I.*, ed. R. Howlett, i. 298.

Between the tenth and the twelfth centuries the education of the nation owed very much to monasticism. Before the Norman Conquest the monastic schools were the best in England, and trained patriots as well as scholars. After 1066 their influence was relatively far greater on account of the rapid increase in their numbers and their higher standards of learning, but in the course of the twelfth century their influence became proportionately less through the multiplication of rival schools and the rise of the universities.

In the field of literature the monks exercised a paramount influence through the continuous development of their historical work in various directions, in the re-editing of old materials, in the provision of new ones, and in the formation of style. Through their appeals to precedents they forced the claims of the study of history upon the Crown and the nation.

The political theories adopted at the several stages of the development of English monasticism were reflected in the history of the nation.

ROYALIST AND CROMWELLIAN ARMIES IN FLANDERS, 1657–1662

By C. H. FIRTH, LL.D.

Read November 20, 1902

In 1657 two small bodies of British troops stood opposed to each other in Flanders. One consisted of English, Irish, and Scottish royalists following the fortunes of Charles II., and serving with the Spanish army. The other was composed of 6,000 English soldiers raised by the Protector to assist the French against the Spaniards, and to secure England a foothold on the Continent. The object of this paper is to show how the two forces were raised, of what regiments they consisted, and by what officers they were commanded. The history of the regiments composing these two little armies will be traced up to the Restoration, and it will be shown how the remains of the Cromwellian contingent and the remains of the royalist force were amalgamated to form the garrison which held Dunkirk for England from 1660 to 1662. Finally I shall endeavour to trace the fate which befell the different regiments of that garrison after Charles II. sold Dunkirk to the French.

I.

Cromwell's treaty with France in October 1655 led to the expulsion of Charles II. and other royalist leaders from France, but Cromwell's breach with Spain, which followed a few months later, secured Charles the support of the Spaniards. Charles was eager to obtain Spanish aid for his

restoration, Spain glad to create a diversion by encouraging a royalist insurrection in England. On April $\frac{2}{12}$, 1656, a treaty was finally concluded between Charles and the king of Spain by which Philip IV. promised Charles a body of 6,000 men to assist in his restoration so soon as he should have secured a port in England where they could be landed. Charles undertook in return certain political engagements to be fulfilled when he should have regained his throne.[1]

As soon as Charles was established in the Low Countries he began to think of raising an army of his own. He began by summoning all his subjects in the French service to leave it, and to march to such places as he should direct.[2] The Spanish government was willing enough to see the forces of France weakened in this way, but unwilling at first to permit Charles to establish depôts in Flanders or to assist him with money in supporting the soldiers he might collect.[3] After much pressure, however, an agreement was arrived at permitting him to raise four regiments, and guaranteeing some contribution to their payment and maintenance. Later still the number of regiments was increased from four to six.[4]

Men came in pretty quickly. At the beginning of October 1656 the King had 400, by the end of the same month 800, and by April 1657 about 2,000.[5] Something between 2,000

[1] For the treaty see *Cal. Clarendon State Papers*, iii. 109.

[2] The proclamation is dated June 20, 1657. A facsimile of it is given in Mr. J. E. Hodgkin's *Rariora*, iii. 41. See also *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. 307; Carte, *Life of Ormond*, iii. 653, ed. 1851.

[3] *Cal. Clarendon State Papers*, iii. 199, 205, 209; Guizot, *Cromwell and the English Commonwealth*, ii. 541, 547

[4] 'The Marquis de Caracena told me the last night, that as soon as ever the general business of the quarters with the country was settled, the four regiments promised his Majesty should also be settled, and that his Majesty might give the command of them to whom he pleased, but that he must tell me freely, that they could not give winter quarters to any more new regiments at a time when they were obliged to cashier above forty of their old ones; and that whatever men should come over to the King, as well Muskerry's as others, must be aggregated to one of those four regiments, which were ground-work enough for a body of four thousand men, which was more than they could hope to see drawn together by his Majesty this winter.' (Bristol to Hyde, Nov. 26, 1656; *Clar. State Papers*, iii. pp. 311-312.)

[5] 'The King of Scotts is at a stand, for all he hath lifted a few men; hee keeps them as yett together: they are about five hundred, of Irish the most of them are,

and 3,000 was probably the highest figure the royal regiments reached, though rumour sometimes gave the King 5,000 or 6,000 men.[1]

As each of the six regiments ought to have numbered 1,000 or 1,200 men apiece, it is evident that their ranks were never more than half full.[2] One of the first regiments to be formed was that known as the King's own regiment, which was at first commanded by Henry Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, with Sir William Throgmorton as his lieutenant-colonel.[3] Rochester fell ill in October 1657, and died in the following February. His regiment seems to have formed the nucleus of that known as the King's Guards, which was established about November 1657 under the command of Colonel Blague.

A second regiment was intended to be composed entirely of Scots, and Lieutenant-General Middleton was its original commander, with Sir James Hamilton as its lieutenant-

some Scots, and some English, who rely upon him, and cannot live otherwise.' (Tho. George to Priestman, 29 October 1656. *Thurloe Papers*, v. p. 533.)

'Take it upon my word, there is not in all 700, for they mutiny every day: their pay is so small, they cannot live upon it. The soldier hath but four stivers a day, and a gentleman six.' (Letter of intelligence, Bruges, Nov. 5, 1656 (N.S.) Thurloe, v. p. 521.)

[1] See the extract from *Mercurius Politicus* printed on p. 72, and Bampfield's letter in *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. 344.

[2] A letter from a spy, printed in *Cal. Clarendon State Papers*, iii. 232, says that the five regiments then raising (January 1657) are to consist of 20 companies each, and each company of 60 men; each soldier has 7 stivers a day, and each officer 14. Another spy, writing in May, says they then numbered 4,000 (*ibid.* p. 283).

[3] Clarendon (*Rebellion*, xvi. 68) and Sir James Turner (*Memoirs*, p. 121) both agree that Rochester's regiment was one of the first regiments raised. Clarendon erroneously states that the Guards were one of the original regiments. The King, he says, 'resolved to raise one regiment of Guards, the command whereof he gave to the Lord Wentworth, which was to do duty in the army as common men till his Majesty should be in such a posture that they might be brought about his person.' Clarendon's correspondence, however, shows that the Guards were not established till October or November 1657 (*Cal. Clarendon Papers*, iii. 364, 368, 379, 405). Two warrants to Blague as its lieutenant-colonel are printed in the *Hist. MSS. Commission's Report on the MSS. of Mr. Eliot Hodgkin*, p. 123. A list of the officers of the Guards is given in Hamilton's *History of the Grenadier Guards*, but that author gives no references to his authorities, and his account of the history of the regiment during 1657–60 contains many errors.

colonel.[1] Middleton, however, was despatched in September 1656 on a mission to Poland in order to raise money, if he could, from Scottish merchants in Dantzic and other ports, and to induce the Scots serving in the Swedish armies to desert that service and join Charles II. in Flanders.[2] In his absence the command of the regiment was given to James Livingstone, Earl of Newburgh, originally its lieutenant-colonel.[3]

The largest of all the regiments was that of which the Marquis of Ormond was titular colonel, which was formed in December 1656. It consisted of Irish soldiers who had deserted from the French service, most of whom had doubtless formed part of the army which Ormond had commanded in Ireland during the years 1649 and 1650. The real commander of the regiment was Ormond's lieutenant-colonel, Colonel Richard Grace.

Grace had been in the Spanish service before, and had transferred himself and his whole regiment to the French service because the Spanish government failed to keep its engagements to him. He now changed sides a second time, and appears to have brought a large part of his regiment with him to Flanders, though at first the Spaniards made some difficulty about receiving him again.[4]

Another strong regiment formed in a very similar fashion

[1] 'The King, by permission of Don Juan of Austria, raised three regiments, one of English under the Earl of Rochester . . . the second of Scots under General Middletone; the third of Irish under Ormond. Two more were added after. . . . All the captaines were to be lords, knights, or colonels; at least 16 captaines were ordered to be of the Scots, whereof I was one.' He adds that about 1658 Middleton's regiment was given to Newburgh, 'Don Juan having commanded, that none should have charge but those who attended it.' *Memoirs of Sir James Turner*, pp. 120, 130. See also, on the history of this regiment, *Cal. Clarendon Papers*, iii. 218, 283, 307. A list of its captains, dated June 4, 1657, is given in Macray's *Ruthven Correspondence*, p. 165

[2] On Middleton's mission, see *ibid.* iii. 204; Turner's *Memoirs*, pp. 120–130; *Scotland and the Protectorate* (Scottish History Society, 1899, pp. 336–345, 355; *Cal. State Papers, Dom.* 1656–7, pp. 322, 345.

[3] For letters of Newburgh, see Carte, xxx. 503.

[4] *Life of James II.* i. 268; *Cal. Clarendon Papers*, iii. 194, 201, 258, 260, 283; *Report on the MSS. of the Duke of Ormond*, ii. 17; *Carte MSS.* xxx. 400–438 inclusive, and ccxiii. 90–92.

was that of the Duke of York. Its lieutenant-colonel was Charles (or Cormac) MacCarty, eldest son of Lord Muskerry. Muskerry commanded an Irish regiment in the French service, which, with another commanded by Sir James Darcy, formed part of the garrison of Condé. In August 1656, when Condé was taken by the Spaniards, Ormond was sent by Charles II. to persuade these Irish regiments to desert the French service. Muskerry was Ormond's nephew, but he refused to listen to Ormond's appeal, and, while promising to join Charles II., protested that his honour as a soldier required him first to lay down his commission in proper form, and to obtain the dismission of himself and his regiment to serve their own king. Cardinal Mazarin refused to let the regiment go, but gave him a pass for himself, and Muskerry joined King Charles in the Low Countries, leaving directions to his regiment to follow him. 'He no sooner gave notice to them whither they should come,' says Clarendon, 'but they so behaved themselves, that by sixes and sevens his whole regiment, to the number of very near 800, came to the place assigned to them, and brought their arms with them; which the Spaniard was amazed at, and ever after very much valued him, and took as much care for the preservation of that regiment as of any that was in their service.'[1]

The fifth and sixth regiments were also Irish. The fifth was that of which the King's younger brother, Henry Duke of Gloucester, was the nominal colonel. Its actual commander appears to have been at first Theobald Lord Taaffe, and in 1659 his son Colonel William Taaffe.[2]

The history of the sixth regiment, which was the last to be formed, is not easy to trace, though its origin is well ascertained. In the winter of 1656–7 a small French garrison,

[1] Carte, *Life of Ormond*, iii. 654–636, ed. 1851; Clarendon, *Rebellion*, xv. 70–74; *Life of James II.* i. 274–6, 280–1, 313; *Cal. Clarendon Papers*, iii. 231, 232, 283; *Report on the Ormond MSS.* i. 18. *Carte MSS.* xxx. 398, is a copy of Muskerry's capitulation with the French government.

[2] *Cal. Clarendon Papers*, iii. 231, 256, 260, 283, 258. See also *Report on the MSS. of Mr. Eliot Hodgkin*, pp. 124, 125, and Lodge's *Irish Peerage*. ii. 377, ed. 1754.

under Schomberg, occupied the little fortress of St. Ghislain, about four leagues from Brussels. A large part of the garrison consisted of Irishmen. George Digby, Earl of Bristol, who had just deserted the French service for the Spanish, entered into negotiation with the officers of the Irish, and won them over by promises of money and appeals to their loyalty to Charles II. to promise to revolt. In March 1657, Don John, with the Spanish army, suddenly invested the place, and the Irish surrendered the outworks of the town to them, so that the garrison were forced to capitulate on the best terms they could get. A few hundred of these Irish troops were formed into a regiment, at first under the command of Lord Bristol, afterwards under Colonel Farrell.[1]

All these six regiments of infantry were placed under the command of the Duke of York, for whom as general a small lifeguard consisting of about fifty horse was raised. 'The Duke of York,' wrote an English spy in June 1657, 'hath a company of fifty horse raised by the Spaniard in very good equipage for his guard; they allow him two hundred pounds per mensem during the campaign for his table.'[2] This troop of horse was commanded by Sir Charles Berkeley, who became after the Restoration Earl of Falmouth.[3]

Both the numbers and the composition of this little army were well known to the English government through their spies on the Continent, and the English public in general was kept informed of the facts through the pages of *Mercurius Politicus*. In the number of that journal published on April 23, 1657, the following account of the royalist forces was published:

'From Bruges in Flanders: April 20, S.N.

'We of this country were in hope we should in some reasonable time have been rid of the forces of the Scottish King, and they made us beleeve so, pretending they should

[1] *Clarendon Rebellion*, xv. 80; *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. pp. lxvi–lxviii; *Cal. Clarendon Papers*, iii. 256, 262, 266, 276, 307; *Report on the MSS. of Mr. Eliot Hodgkin*, p. 125.

[2] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. 344.

[3] *Life of James II.* i. 327, 349.

before now have great friends to assist them, and great opportunities to let them into some part of the British Dominions, but now we perceive they are like to lie here longer; for their forces here already are not many, and those which they expect from Middleton (who is still somewhere about Hambourgh, enticing what Scots he can out of the Swedish service) will not much augment them. The said Middleton hath a regiment of Scots which lie quartered at Bens [*sic*] in Hainault, and Sir James Hamilton was appointed to be his Lieutenant Colonel, but before Middleton went away, Sir James Levingstone, now called Lord Newburgh, procured the Lieutenant Colonel's place for a sum of money; but this regiment of Middleton's exceeds not 300 men.

'Most of their other forces (in a manner all) are Irish, as those under the Marquis of Ormond, whose regiment is bigger than any other, consisting of 700 men, and they lie quartered at Damme, a place not far from here. This regiment is committed to the care of one Colonel Grace, a man famous for his cruelties, and many bloody villanies in the Irish rebellion.

'More Irish there are, as those under the titular Duke of Gloucester, who hath a regiment likewise, which at their muster appeared to be 400. He bears the name of them, but another of the old rebels commands them, to wit, the Lord Viscount Taaffe, and these lie quartered at a place called Brice le Conté, not far from Brussels.

'They are very high in discourse about raising some other regiments, especially one of horse, and another of foot, which they say shall be as guards to their titular King. The Lord Wentworth feeds himself with hopes of commanding the foot, and the Lord Gerard the horse, when they can get them; for very few English come near them, and those fugitives of England which are abroad have not many of them appeared here, as is to be seen by the Lord Wilmot's regiment, which consists all of English, yet make not above 300 men, being quartered at Leerce, and he hath Sir William Throgmorton for his Lieutenant Colonell.

'There is another regiment of Irish, which belongs to the titular Duke of York, but are commanded by Mac Carta, the Lord Muskirries son; another most notorious in the Irish Rebellion; and these have taken up their quarters at Louvain, being about 250 men.'[1]

Other numbers of the same newspaper described in still more uncomplimentary terms the character and composition of the King's forces.

'Those English that are among them follow their old wont of vapbring and carousing, bragging to be their own carvers of other men's estates and fortunes, if ever they get but foot in England. And their old trade of lying they still follow, coyning many stories of tumults and broils at London. At present there is a feud betwixt them and the Irish, because these are best treated here, and with most respect, as being the white boys, and likest to be most true to the Spaniard, and the most keen instruments against the Puritan Roundhead rebels, which is the name they give to the Protestant party in England, Scotland, and Ireland.'[2]

According to the same authority, very prejudiced it must be freely admitted, the discipline of the royal forces was excessively bad, and there is some evidence from other sources that the charge was true.[3]

'Of all the armies in Europe there is none wherein so much debauchery is to be seen as in these few forces which the said King hath gotten together, being so exceeding profane from the highest to the lowest. The Irish are trump among them, and bear away the bell for number and preferment, being such as are most gratefull to the Spaniard, and surest to the Stuarts' interest, because they are men implacable and irreconcilable to England.'[4]

As the army was primarily intended to serve as a nucleus of a general royalist rising in England, these details

[1] *Mercurius Politicus*, April 16–23, 1657, p. 7750.
[2] *Ibid.* Jan. 8, 1657, p. 7508.
[3] Duels were very frequent amongst the officers.
[4] *Merc. Polit.* April 16–23, p. 7737.

had a special interest for English readers, and the fact that it consisted mainly of Irishmen would certainly have proved a serious obstacle to the popularity of the King's cause, if Charles had ever succeeded in landing in England. At present, however, the necessary preliminary of any such attempt was that the Spanish army should drive the French out of the Netherlands. Until that was done the Spaniards could scarcely spare troops or money to assist the King's intended expedition. The little army the King had collected began its career by serving as a contingent in the Spanish army under Don John and Condé, and as the fortunes of Spain sank lower and lower the prospects of the expedition to England grew more and more unfavourable.

At the opening of the campagn of 1657, that is about June 1657, the Duke of York joined the Spanish army with four regiments of foot.[1] The army numbered altogether about 15,000 men, of whom, according to Ormond, the King's men formed about 2,000. He described them as being 'as handsome fellows as ever I saw.'[2] The Duke of York puts the strength of his force at the same figure. If the Spaniards, says he, had kept their promises, the number would have been much greater. They had undertaken to give every man who came over a pistole apiece, and to supply him with arms, and to give the deserters good usage afterwards. But they 'had conceived such jealousy that the King's troops were too numerous that they gave them all manner of discouragement: for which reason their numbers could not be increased, and indeed it was all that could be done to keep them as strong as when I marched them into the field at first, to join the Spanish army.'[3]

II

About the same time that the Duke of York and his 2,000 men joined the Spanish army in the field, the contingent

[1] Thurloe, vi. 345. [2] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. 347.
[3] *Life of James II.* i. 297.

sent by Cromwell to assist the French joined the army under Turenne. A closer alliance with France was the natural result of Cromwell's war with Spain. By the defeat of the Spanish armies in Flanders he would gain security from the threatened royalist expedition to England, as well as the foothold on the Continent which his foreign policy demanded. Thus the treaty signed at Paris on March $\frac{23}{13}$, 1657, had a defensive as well as an aggressive side. According to the stipulations of the treaty, Dunkirk and Mardyke were to be besieged by the Anglo-French army and handed over to Cromwell. Six thousand Englishmen were to be sent over to serve with the French as a separate corps, half of whom were to be transported and armed at the expense of France, the other half at the expense of the Protector. It was specially stipulated that the 6,000 must be Englishmen, not Scots or Irish.[1]

During April 1657 the Protector's contingent was raised and organised into regiments. Only a portion of it consisted of old soldiers. Fourteen hundred and seventy-five men were drafted from the various regiments in England; the rest appear to have been volunteers got together for this particular expedition.[2] These volunteers, however, were probably in many cases men of some military experience, not raw recruits, for the number of disbanded soldiers available in England was very large.[3] The whole contingent consisted of infantry, for the French army was strong in horse, but weak in foot. The uniform of the 6,000 was the ordinary uniform of the Cromwellian army. 'They had new red coats given them for the terrible name thereof,' says Heath in his *Chronicle*. Their armament, however, differed in one important respect from that of the regiments of the standing army. In the English regiment of the period two thirds of the men were musketeers and one third pikemen, but in this contingent, if the terms of

[1] Guizot, *Cromwell and the English Commonwealth*, ii. 562.

[2] *Cal. State Papers, Dom.* 1656–7, p. 374.

[3] Heath states that Cromwell had 'trained and drilled most of them as recruits to Colonel Barkstead's regiment of the Tower.' (*Chronicle*, p. 720.)

the treaty were observed, the numbers of musketeers and pikemen were equal.[1]

The commander-in-chief of the contingent was Sir John Reynolds, who held, at the time when he was appointed, the rank of commissary-general in the Irish army. Next to him in rank came Major-General Thomas Morgan, who had been for some time second in command to Monck in Scotland.[2] Reynolds and Morgan had each the command of a regiment; the four other colonels were Alsop, Clark, Cochrane, and Lillingston. Roger Alsop was the only one of the four who already held a commission in the regular army. He had been in 1647 a captain in Colonel Pride's regiment, and became in 1650 marshal-general of the army, *i.e.* provost-marshal, and was very eager to get a chance of active service again.[3] Samuel Clark seems to have been an English officer in Dutch service, who had not served hitherto either in the armies of the Parliament or the Republic.[4] Sir Bryce Cochrane was a Scot who had actually fought against England, and had been taken prisoner in the fight at Musselburgh in July 1650. But in September 1648 Cochrane had assisted Monck, who was then commanding the English forces in

[1] Guizot, ii. 564.

[2] Lives of both are to be found in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. Morgan had served in the French army before. Bordeaux writes on May 31, 1657: 'Le colonel qui doit servir de major general vint disner chez moi hier, et me tesmoigna estre fort aise de retourner en France, ou il a servy de capitaine dans le regiment de Colonel Coulon.' (*R.O. Transcripts.*)

[3] Alsop gave the following account of himself in a petition which he addressed to the Protector in September 1656:

'In 1650, during the service in Scotland, you took from me my captain's place, and made me Marshal General, though I earnestly desired to be excused, preferring actual service upon the enemy, but I took it in obedience to you, and you promised me a lieutenant-colonel's pay and preferment. Yet my pay has been less than a foot captain's, and my profits small. I have to keep horses, servants, &c., and have only had the poorer sort of prisoners, who cannot pay for their quarters, nor pay fees, and I am 500*l.* poorer than when I took the employment.' (*Cal. S.P., Dom.* 1656–7, p. 94.)

[4] A note on the character of the officers in Flanders says of Clark: 'a civil man, but never served the Parliament till now,' *i.e.* 1659. It goes on to say of his lieutenant-colonel, William Beadle: 'a civil man, but served with his colonel in Holland till late.' (*Rawlinson MS. A*, lxv. 185.)

Ulster, to surprise Carrickfergus, and in return for this service Monck now used his influence to get Cochrane this employment.[1] Henry Lillingston, the sixth colonel, is an officer whose previous career is completely unknown, and whose later life is equally difficult to trace.[2]

The regimental officers were drawn from various sources. A certain number of captains and lieutenants in Monck's army and in the English army obtained higher commissions, but many of the officers seem to have been men of little military experience. There were a certain number of veterans among the officers as among the men, but the bulk of them had no claim to the title, though it is frequently bestowed upon them by historians.

The English contingent landed at Boulogne about the middle of May 1657. The newspapers give a full account of their embarcation and reception by the French.

'Blackheath by Greenwich: May 1.

'This day here was a rendez-vous of the new raised forces which are to go beyond sea, and (it is said) under the command of Sir John Reynolds. They were in all six regiments, stout men, and fit for action, as was manifest at their appearance. Words of exhortation and encouragement were given them in a sermon by Mr. Hugh Peters, exhorting them that when they come abroad they be sure to avoid the vices of other places, and to remember the virtuous and victorious

[1] On Cochrane see Coxe, *Hibernia Anglicana*, ii. 203; Thurloe, iii. 18; *Cromwelliana*, p. 87.

[2] It is very likely that Lillingston had been in the Dutch service. At all events he seems to have been in that service later. H. Lillingston appears as lieutenant-colonel of Lord Mulgrave's regiment in the army raised by Charles II. (January 25, 1673), while Luke Lillingston, whom I take to be his son, was ensign in that regiment at the same date. (Dalton, *English Army Lists*, i. 136.) In the winter of 1674 the Prince of Orange raised two regiments of Englishmen whose colonels' names were Disney and Lillingston. (*Life of Major John Bernardi*, p. 20.) I take the latter to have been Colonel Henry Lillingston. Colonel Lillingston is said to have died next year. Luke Lillingston appears as a captain in the Dutch service in 1678–9 (Ferguson, *Scots Brigade in Holland*, pp. 513–4), and became a colonel in the English service in 1693 (Dalton, ii. 229).

military discipline of England, by which (through God's blessing) so many great actions have been performed at home. This wrought upon the hearts of the soldiers so, that they declared themselves with alacrity resolved to hold up the honor and renown of England abroad. Afterwards, five hundred being drawn out of each regiment, which made up the number of three thousand, these immediately began their march hence toward the sea-side, being to imbarque at Dover, from thence to be transported to Calais. The other three thousand are disposed up and down in quarters, waiting further orders; which they expect some time next week, and then to follow their fellows.'[1]

'Whitehall: May 12.

'We had an account of the disposing of the forces newly raised, under the command of the Right Honorable Sir John Reynolds, for the service of France. The honorable Major General Kelsey, and Capt. Hatsel, being at Dover, by the direction of his Highness and the Council, to take care of the imbarquing of the said forces, did on Friday and Saturday last week (having first given them a moneth's pay) put three thousand five hundred of them on board; who at their imbarquing manifested a great alacrity and resolution, to stand for the honor of their nation in this undertaking. They were not long at sea before they landed at St. John's Bay, which is about seven miles from Bouloign in France, where they were met by a person of honor appointed from the King of France to receive them; as also by the Governor of Bouloign, with many of the French gentry, to entertain and welcome them into those parts. The said person of honor gave them (in his Majesties name) very good assurance that whatever was agreed on should be faithfully performed, and nothing be wanting which might be for their encouragement.

'The remainder of the 6,000 forces are expected by the French, and when they are arrived there is three moneths'

[1] *Merc. Polit.* No. 360, p. 7769, April 30–May 7. See also pp. 7784 and 7790.

pay to be advanced to them all. In the mean time, care is taken by that honorable person for the accommodation of them in their quarters in and about Bouloign.

'Part of the forces that are behinde, which were quartered in the road towards Dover, have received orders to march thither, where the like care will be taken for their immediate transportation.

'Yesterday one thousand old soldiers were rendezvoused upon Black-Heath, by Greenwich, very gallant men, who are advanced to complete the number.

'The French expressed a great deal of joy and satisfaction upon the landing of the former, and they gave a volley of great guns, for a farewel, at the return of our ships.'[1]

'May 20.

'By some persons returned this day from Dover, we had an account of the imbarquing of the remainder of the new raised forces under the command of the right honorable Sir John Reynolds; which was performed on Saturday last, and they safely arrived near Bouloign, where the officers of the King of France lay ready to receive them, and disposed them in quarters among their fellows, in and about Bouloign, they making in all 6,000 men. The French declared much joy and satisfaction upon their landing, and it was expected that on Sunday night last the King and Queen of France, with a great train of the nobility, would come down thither, in order to the viewing them on the morrow. Sir John Reynolds went from Dover, being shipped on Sunday in the evening; and M. G. Morgan, a person of much honor and merit in military affairs, and in that respect fit to serve under so valiant and worthy a General, is within a day or two to follow him in the quality of Major General: so that we doubt not but a good account will be given of this expedition, undertaken for the honor and service of this commonwealth in France.'[2]

[1] *Merc. Polit.* No. 361, p. 7790, May 7–14, 1657.
[2] *Ibid.* No. 362, p. 7796, May 14–21, 1657.

The English contingent were well satisfied with their reception by their allies. 'Our army,' says one letter from the camp, 'have been very civilly treated.' 'We are nobly treated,' says a second. Lockhart, Cromwell's ambassador, reflecting upon the 'extraordinary kindness shown the English forces,' was tempted to believe that 'something may lurk at the bottom of so much caress.' The soldiers, though inclined to grumble a little at the French munition bread, brown bread to which they were not accustomed, and missing the cheese which was part of their rations in England, were consoled by the liberality with which they were provided with wine and beer.[1]

In addition to this the then important question of regimental precedence was settled very much in favour of the English force. 'I have settled the business of the march of your forces thus,' writes Lockhart to Thurloe: 'they take place of all the regiments of the army, save the two old regiments of guards; and care will be had that there shall be no occasion to dispute it with them, because their infantry will always march in two wings at least; and when the army is ranged in battle, the one will have the right wing, the other the left.'[2]

The only cause of complaint amongst the English troops was the lowness of the pay they received, which was much less than they were accustomed to get in England, and they

[1] *Clarke Papers*, iii. 110; Thurloe, vi. 290, 291, 297. Compare the following extract from a newspaper:

'From the English head quarters at Rue in Picardie,
between Abbeville and Montreul, June 1, S.N.

'We are nobly treated, after the manner of this country, in all places, and hope the kindnes will hold. We are quartered in their townes, and visited by their governors and magistrates. A gentleman comes each day to perform civility to our officers, in the name of the Cardinal. The king's own troop of gentlemen were divided by his appointment, and one half of them ordered to march before us. Wine and beer is plentifully given to our soldiers in each night's quarters. Our men, if sick or lame, are lodged in the houses of burgers; and indeed the French do give many demonstrations of really affecting our nation, and an union with it. We depend upon the Lord for success.' (*Merc. Polit.* No. 363, p. 7809, May 21–28, 1657.)

[2] Thurloe, vi. 287.

asked that the Protector should allow them threepence a day extra to make up the difference.[1] On the French side there was, on the other hand, a complaint at the late arrival of the English forces upon the field, and a suggestion that it would retard the progress of the campaign and diminish its success.[2]

The history of the campaigns of 1657 and 1658, however, is not part of the subject of this paper, which concerns itself simply with the story of the two English armies that took part in the military operations of those years. Cromwell's 6,000 men joined Turenne's army at St. Quentin early in June, and assisted in the captures of Montmédy and St. Venant, and in the relief of Ardres. By the time they had been three months in the field, they had lost a third of their numbers, not through losses in battle, but owing to the hardships of the campaign.

On September 1, 1657, Reynolds wrote to Henry Cromwell begging to be recalled, and describing himself as 'having warred here till 6,000 men are less than foure, without fighting, which is not the custom of the country. However, if I must fight untill my dagger, which was a sword, become an oyster-knife, I am content and submit.'[3] The Protector, who was dissatisfied with the employment of his forces in the interior of Flanders instead of in an attack on the Flemish seaports, now pressed the French government to turn its arms against Dunkirk and Mardyke without further delay. Turenne undertook that Mardyke should be besieged at once, and Cromwell on his part agreed to send over 2,000 recruits to fill the gaps in the English contingent.[4]

In accordance with this undertaking, Turenne, about the

[1] Thurloe, vi. 287, 290, 297; cf. *Clarke Papers*, iii. 111. Ere long the pay fell into arrears; cf. Thurloe, vi. 487; Bourelly, p. 27.

[2] Thurloe, vi. 288, 290. In defending the conduct of his government on this point, Lockhart doubtless pointed out that the French had not provided the arms for three thousand men which they were by treaty bound to furnish. But there was some foundation for the complaint, as the same letter shows. (*Ibid.* 290.)

[3] *Lansdowne MS.* 823, f. 114; cf. Thurloe, vi. 523.

[4] *Ibid.* vi. 522, 524; Bourelly, *Cromwell et Mazarin*, p. 34; *Clarke Papers*, iii. 119. An account of their despatch is given in *Mercurius Politicus*, p. 1648.

end of September, besieged and took the fort of Mardyke, which was immediately handed over to the English. The Spaniards made an attempt to retake it by storm on the night of October 22, and though the attack was successfully repulsed the danger of its repetition necessitated the maintenance of a considerable garrison in this new conquest. The fort was small, the situation of the place unhealthy, and the English soldiers were badly provided with necessaries of every kind. The regiments of the English contingent quartered there, and those which quartered at the neighbouring village of Bourbourg, or remained with the French army in its winter quarters on the borders of Artois, all suffered terribly from sickness and privations during the winter of 1657–8. By the end of January the English contingent was reduced from 6,000 to 3,000 men, making a total loss of about 5,000 men since its landing in Flanders.[1] Reynolds continually wrote for reinforcements and supplies for his diminishing army. As early as November he had demanded, and perhaps obtained, 500 fresh men from England.[2] At the same time he urged Turenne to send back to Mardyke the three regiments of English serving with the French field army, which were then stationed in winter quarters near Guisnes, where they suffered little less than their comrades at Mardyke.[3] About the beginning of

[1] *Clarke Papers*, iii. 121, 123, 135. On December 5, 1657, Reynolds wrote to Turenne that there were only 1,800 serviceable men left out of all the English in France and Flanders (Thurloe, p. 659). Bourelly says in a note (p. 41), 'A la fin de l'hiver, plus de 2,000 Anglais étaient morts dans ce triste réduit de Mardick' (La Mesnardière, *Relations de guerre &c.*). See also Bourelly, p. 52. The English royalists quartered at Oudekerke, near Dunkirk, also suffered very severely during the winter. 'Few of the officers or soldiers, excepting only the natural Spaniards, escaped agues; insomuch that wee had never half our men together in a condition of doing duty. It fell the most severely on those troopes I commanded; for, excepting myself, there was scarcely an officer or volunteer of quality, or any of my servants, who was free from an ague. My brother the Duke of Glocester went out of the army sick of that distemper; and the Prince of Condé was seiz'd with it to that degree that he was once given over by the phisitians.' (*Life James II.* 317, 322.)

[2] Thurloe, vi. 637, 653.

[3] Thurloe, vi. 659. What remained of these regiments formed the garrison of Mardyke about January (*ibid.* vi. 709, 725).

December Reynolds became impatient at the neglect with which his demands were treated, and set out for England to represent the necessities of his forces. With him went the governor of Mardyke, Colonel Francis White, but the vessel in which they embarked was wrecked on the Goodwin Sands, and both perished.[1] Major-General Morgan now took command both of the garrison and of the English forces as a whole, but when the time for action drew near Cromwell superseded him, and made Sir William Lockhart, his ambassador at Paris, general of the English forces and colonel of the regiment lately commanded by Reynolds.

Lockhart, wisely, did not demand large reinforcements during the winter for Mardyke. 'I do not believe,' said he, 'that the cramming it with great numbers of men will signify much for its defence.'[2] So long as the English fleet commanded the sea the place could be reinforced whenever the Spaniards should attack it. Cromwell contented himself therefore for the moment with sending over four or five companies of old soldiers belonging to the regiment of Colonel Gibbons, and with warning the regiments quartered in Kent to be ready to embark at a moment's notice.[3] In spring the time for action arrived, and on March 28, 1658, a new treaty was signed by Lockhart at Paris prolonging the league with France for another year. Between 3,000 and 4,000 men were to be sent to Flanders to raise the English contingent to its original strength, and the campaign was to open with the siege of Dunkirk.[4] Before May ended about 3,300 men had been despatched to Lockhart's army, of whom 1,000 were old soldiers.[5] Of these veterans five companies were drawn from the regiment of Colonel Gibbon and five from that of Colonel

[1] Thurloe, vi. 665, 676, 680, 686, 735; Bourelly, p. 58; *Life of James II.* i. 328.

[2] Thurloe, vi. 695.

[3] *Ibid.* vi. 615, 659, 676, 677.

[4] *Ibid.* vi. 804, 853; Bourelly, pp. 83–85.

[5] According to Lockhart, 2,079 men, 'and most of them raw men,' landed before May $\frac{6}{16}$. Four or five days later 270 more arrived (Thurloe, vii. 116, 127).

Salmon, making a composite regiment commanded by Colonel Pepper.[1]

The campaign of 1658 began in May. Turenne effected his junction with the forces at Mardyke about May $\frac{14}{24}$, and invested Dunkirk on the following day. The Spaniards under Don Juan and Condé advanced to raise the siege, and the battle of the Dunes was fought on June $\frac{4}{14}$. In that battle the Cromwellian soldiers and the English royalists met hand to hand, so that it seems in some sort a continuation of the English Civil War, and not merely an incident in the European struggle between France and Spain. Lockhart's army left fourteen selected companies behind them to guard the trenches,[2] but all the seven regiments of his command were represented on the field. Of the King's six regiments, however, only five were in the battle, for the Duke of Gloucester's regiment had been captured by Turenne at Mount Cassel at the very beginning of the campaign. These five regiments, being weak in numbers, formed but three battalions. The first, consisting of Charles the Second's footguards and Lord Bristol's regiment, was commanded by Lieut.-Col. Thomas Blague of the former regiment.[3] The second consisted of the Duke of York's regiment under Lord Muskerry.[4] The third was formed by Ormond's regiment of Irish under Colonel Richard Grace, and Lord Newburgh's regiment of Scots under Sir William Urry.[5]

Amongst the Cromwellian troops Lockhart's regiment of foot bore the brunt of the fighting. Its lieutenant-colonel, Fenwick, and two of its captains were killed, and nearly all the rest of its officers were wounded. Lillingston's

[1] *Clarke Papers*, iii. 151, 152; Thurloe, vii. 115. Turenne had urged that two whole regiments of old soldiers should be sent (*ibid.* vii. 52).

[2] It consisted of about 400 men. *Life of James II.* i. 336; *Clarke Papers*, iii. 150; Bourelly, p. 138.

[3] *Life of James II.* i. 345; *Clarke Papers*, iii. 154.

[4] *Life of James II.* i. 345, 354.

[5] *Ibid.*; *Clarke Papers*, iii. 154. William Urry, originally major of the Scottish regiment, became its lieutenant-colonel on November 1, 1658. (Macray, *Ruthven Correspondence*, p. 166.)

lost a captain and thirty or forty killed, while the other regiments suffered only slight losses.[1] On the other side two out of the three royalist battalions were almost annihilated. The King's footguards stood their ground well, but were finally obliged to surrender. Bristol's and York's Irish regiments were routed and cut to pieces. Only the third battalion, commanded by Colonel Grace, succeeded in effecting an orderly retreat, and marched off the field intact.[2] The Duke of York's troop of guards, which charged several times with the Duke himself at its head, suffered severely, but also remained fit for further service. The King's forces after the battle numbered less than a thousand men, probably not more than seven or eight hundred. All prospect of the intended expedition to England came to an end, and at the same time the defeat of the Spanish army necessarily entailed the fall of Dunkirk. It surrendered ten days after the battle (June $\frac{14}{24}$), and was immediately handed over to the Protector's troops, as the treaty required.

The campaign of the English contingent in Flanders did not end with the battle of the Dunes and the capture of Dunkirk. Part of the English contingent was left to garrison Dunkirk and Mardyke under the command of Sir William Lockhart, whilst the rest, under Sir Thomas Morgan, continued to serve with Turenne's army in the field. Morgan's command consisted of four regiments, viz. his own, and those of Cochrane, Clarke, and Lillingston.[3] They distinguished themselves at the siege of Bergues, where Lieut.-Col. Hughes of Cochrane's regiment was killed, and still more at the siege of Ypres, according to Morgan's own story. At the close of

[1] *Clarke Papers*, iii. 154; Thurloe, vii. 156, 160; *Cal. S. P., Dom.* 1658–9, p. 97.

[2] *Life of James II.* i. 353, 354, 359.

[3] 'I finde the 4 regiments with mee and la Ferté, viz. my owne, Colone Lillingeston's, Sir Brice Cochron's, and Collonel Clarcke's, are much weakened by the losse of those wee have had killed and wounded both at the battaile, and seidges before Dunkerke and Bergin; though I will assure you that nothing is wanting in mee to preserve them, yet our last recruits fell sicke verie fast.' (Morgan to Thurloe, Thurloe, vii. 200; cf. *Clarke Papers*, iii. 160.) Lockhart sent 500 recruits to Morgan in August (Thurloe, vii. 305, 308).

the campaign, by which time their numbers were much diminished, they did not rejoin the rest of the English contingent, but were put into winter quarters at Amiens and in the country round.[1]

In the report which Lockhart made to Cromwell immediately after the occupation of Dunkirk he gave it as his opinion that the garrison ought to consist of 4,000 foot and about 400 horse. Two thousand five hundred foot should be placed in Dunkirk, 1,000 at Mardyke, and 500 in an outwork of Dunkirk called the Fort Royal.[2] Cromwell sent over the remainder of the regiments of Salmon and Gibbons directly the town was taken, so that Lockhart had under his command two regiments of the Flemish contingent, namely his own and that of Colonel Alsop, and two old regiments belonging to the English establishment, viz. those of Gibbon and Salmon. A regiment of 600 horse was raised in England and sent over about the beginning of August or the end of July, but Lockhart complained that the officers of that regiment were mostly men of little experience or capacity.[3] And though he had the four regiments he demanded their ranks were so thin that he had never more than 3,000 men, if so many.[4] Some recruits were sent him, but not enough, for he had to send 500 of them to the regiments in the field, and the troops at Dunkirk were very unhealthy.[5] Lockhart therefore felt obliged to recall one of the regiments with Turenne, but Turenne refused to permit it to leave his army,

[1] Guizot, *Richard Cromwell*, i. 292; *Merc. Polit.*

[2] Thurloe, vii. 170.

[3] *Ibid.* vii. 175, 179. The 'state of the garrison of Dunkirk' printed in Thurloe, vii. 239, shows the cost of the garrison rather than its numbers, but there are some musters amongst the Rawlinson MSS. in the Bodleian (A. lix. 87). Nine companies of Gibbons's regiment and eight of Salmon's were mustered at Dunkirk on $\frac{\text{June } 24}{\text{July } 4}$; the place of the absent companies was filled by companies belonging to different regiments quartered in England.

[4] Lockhart was the nominal colonel of the regiment, but from August 1659 Major Tobias Bridge was its real commander. See *Commons' Journals*, vii. 760; *Cal. State Papers, Dom.* 1659–60, pp. 151, 105, 143; Thurloe, vii. 170, 239, 274, 319.

[5] Thurloe, vii. 306.

though at last, after considerable dispute, half of Lillingston's regiment was sent back to Dunkirk.[1] The continued successes of the French army prevented the Spanish forces from making any attempt against Dunkirk, so the deficiency in the numbers of the garrison was no source of danger. When Richard Cromwell succeeded his father, Lockhart proclaimed Richard at Dunkirk, and the regiments there presented a loyal address to the new Protector.[2] The new government once more sent Lockhart to represent it at the French Court, though the French ambassador in England declared that he could ill be spared from his post at Dunkirk. 'It is certain,' declared Bordeaux, 'that unless they send in his place some person more vigilant than the majority of English officers, the enemy will find it easy enough, when the King's army is at a distance from the coast, to gain possession of the town, either by suborning the soldiers or taking them by surprise. I have not forgotten of late to point out the necessity of guarding against such a contingency, especially as I have heard that watch is not kept with such care as in our frontier fortresses.'[3] The English government had so little fear of such contingencies that, at the end of December 1659, it recalled from Dunkirk the two regiments of Salmon and Gibbons as no longer necessary. Two companies of these regiments were, however, to stay at Dunkirk, and 400 old soldiers drawn from the regiments in England were promised to reinforce the garrison. Lockhart was also instructed to call in the 'supernumerary companies of English which are now in the service of the King of France,' meaning apparently the other half of Lillingston's regiment.[4] The five companies were accordingly sent for from Amiens, but only half their number reached Dunkirk, as the vessel containing the other

[1] Thurloe, vii. 215, 238, 319.

[2] The address is printed in *Merc. Polit.*, October 7–14, 1659. See also pp. 874, 893, 922.

[3] Guizot, *Richard Cromwell*, i. 235.

[4] Thurloe, vii. 579; *Clarke Papers*, iii. 171. See also Guizot, i. 285. The old soldiers would not go to Flanders, so recruits were sent instead.

half was lost at sea.[1] The net result of these changes was that the garrison was considerably reduced in numbers, and as the fortifications of both Dunkirk and Mardyke were greatly decayed, and money for the necessary work was almost entirely lacking, the responsibility of its governor was by no means light. In Lockhart's absence the duties of the post were performed by Alsop and Lillingston.

III

The war in Flanders and the rule of the house of Cromwell ended simultaneously. On $\frac{\text{April } 28}{\text{May } 8}$, 1659, a suspension of arms was agreed upon between France and Spain, and in this cessation England was included as far as Dunkirk was concerned.[2] On May $\frac{7}{17}$, nine days later, the Long Parliament was restored and reinstalled at Westminster. It seemed probable that Lockhart's relationship to the house of Cromwell, and his devotion to the service of the two Protectors, would involve him in Richard's fall. But Lockhart, following the wishes of the soldiers of his garrison, accepted the change, and submitted to the new authority. His declaration and his account of the condition of Dunkirk and its garrison were read in Parliament on May 18, 1659.[3]

[1] Thurloe, iii. 179, iv. 283; Guizot, *Richard Cromwell*, i. 292.

[2] Chéruel, *Histoire de France sous le ministère de Mazarin*, iii. 221.

[3] See Guizot, *Richard Cromwell* (translated by Scoble, 1856), i. 391, 398, 402, 409; *Commons' Journals*, vii. 657, and Lockhart's own letter of May 17, 1659; Thurloe, vii. 670. Colonel Alsop gives the following account of Lockhart's speech to the garrison:

'His excellency did then and there acquaint the officers with the transactions of things in England; and did also exhort and command the officers to a strict performance of their duty, notwithstanding the cessation made betwixt the two crowns of France and Spain, giving them good reasons to incite them thereunto; and did also acquaint them, that notwithstanding the change of government, which is now in England, that we were not to look upon particulars with the same eye, that we are bound in duty to look upon things of public concernment. And although the government were altered, the nation is still the same, and the concernment of the public also the same; for which we are immediately to act; and having through the providence of God procured this town to the use of our country, that we are to lay forth ourselves to the utmost of our power to keep and maintain it for the use aforesaid.' (Thurloe, vii. 671.)

The works both of Dunkirk and the adjacent forts were still unfinished, and the place was in no condition to stand a siege. 'It would in my opinion,' wrote Colonel Alsop, 'very highly reflect upon the honour and reputation of our nation, if we should lose this town unhandsomely, that hath been so famous in our thoughts before we had it.' Money was urgently needed not only to pay workmen, but to pay the soldiers of the garrison, who were many weeks in arrears.[1]

Lockhart's first step on reassuming the government of Dunkirk was to recall the three regiments serving with the French army. It was feared, according to Ludlow, that they might either be detained by the French or obstructed in their return by the Spaniards, and in any case it was desirable to reinforce the garrison now that it was no longer protected by the operations of Turenne's army. For there was a general conviction that, if an opportunity of regaining Dunkirk offered itself, the Spaniards would not be very scrupulous about observing the truce. The three regiments with Turenne, those of Morgan, Clarke, and Cochrane, which were still at Amiens, were ordered to march thence on May $\frac{16}{6}$, and a month later they were encamped under canvas just outside the walls of Dunkirk.[2] Addresses from them and the regiments forming the garison of Dunkirk were presented to Parliament in the course of July.[3] The case of the three regiments late in French service was rather hard. 'They seem to be much troubled,' wrote Colonels Lillingston and Alsop, 'that no course is taken for them, by reason they are wholly forth of the French pay; and here is nothing to be got but for ready money, and that at a very dear rate.' No provision had yet been made for them in the English establishment, but the three regiments forming the garrison

[1] Thurloe, vii. 668. A report presented to the Parliament on April 7, 1659, showed that the forces in Flanders and the garrison of Dunkirk cost 5,951*l.* per month, and that over two months' pay was owing to them. (*Commons' Journal*, vii. 629, 631.)

[2] *Commons' Journals*, vii. 657; Ludlow, *Memoirs*, ii. 96, ed. 1894; Thurloe, vii. 670, 694, 721.

[3] On July 19 from the three regiments late in French service; on July 27 from those at Dunkirk. (*Commons' Journals*, vii. 723, 735.)

were not much better off, for though they were on the establishment they had received no pay for some time. Early in June a plot had been formed amongst them to pay themselves by plundering the town, but the attempted mutiny was suppressed with little difficulty by their commanders.[1] Parliament contrived to scrape together some money to satisfy them for the present, and sent over three officers to examine into the state of the garrison and the fortifications, and to discover how much the town itself could be made to contribute to the support of the troops.[2]

When the royalist rising headed by Sir George Booth broke out, Parliament needed more troops in England, and on August 4, 1657, Sir Brice Cochrane was ordered to go to Dunkirk, and to bring over his own regiment and those of Morgan and Clarke.[3] He started at once, and the following account of the embarcation of the three regiments is given in a letter from Colonels Lillingston and Alsop :

'Sir Bryce Cockram came hither about four of the clock, and gave orders to the drums of the three field regiments to beat, for to ship the men away for England ; which was done, but in so much confusion (notwithstanding that he carried it high, laying commands upon us to serve him much alike unto servants) that this garrison has suffered much prejudice thereby, by their carrying away near 200 of our soldiers, much to the weakening of our small number. We afforded him and the rest all the assistance imaginable. We spoke to the officers, desiring them that they would be very cautious in carying away any of our soldiers ; and they promised us that they would carry away none ; but upon inquiry how many are missed out of each regiment and company we find wanting near about the number aforesaid. Indeed it could not be well prevented by us, by reason of their being shipped by night ; but by information of some of our officers we hear that many of our soldiers were disguised (in their cloaths, &c.,

[1] *Clarke Papers*, iii. 283 ; they seem to have been paid soon after the mutiny. (Thurloe, vii. 707.)

[2] Colonels Packer and Ashfield and Lieutenant-Colonel Pearson. For their letters and report see Thurloe, vii. 694, 699, 712–79.

[3] *Cal. State Papers, Dom.* 1659–60, pp. 58, 74.

without red coats) by some officers of those regiments, on purpose to deceive us. Our number of foot here amounteth not to above 2,500 fighting men, which is a very weak garison for this place with its forts. We made it our desires to the commissioners that there might be a recruit for these three regiments, to complete them to the number of 3,000, which will be a good ordinary garrison for this place ; and with fewer we dare not promise you to keep it if we should be besieged ; but with that number, and the regiment of horse, we hope, through the assistance of the Lord, we shall be able to give you such an account thereof, as may become honest men and persons fit to be intrusted with the charge of the garrison. Here are four companies (two of Colonel Salmon's and two of Colonel Gibbons's regiments) who are in a very longing condition to be relieved from hence, their regiments being in England ; and the truth is, they are but weak, and daily weaker by their soldiers dropping away for England.'[1]

The three regiments landed at Gravesend about August 8, and, as their numbers had been greatly diminished by the campaign, were reorganised and reduced into two under the command of Clarke and Cochrane.[2] After the suppression of the insurrection they were split up into detachments, and stationed in various towns in the West and the Midlands. Neither they nor their officers played any prominent part in the political struggle which marked the winter of 1659. When Monck marched into England he found Clarke's regiment quartered in Yorkshire, and ordered it to Scotland to reinforce the troops he had left behind to occupy that country. Clarke became a warm supporter of Monck's policy, and kept his regiment in good order.[3] It was disbanded at Leith about December 1660.

The other regiment from Flanders, Cochrane's, came to an end sooner. During the interruption of Parliament in the autumn of 1659 part of it was quartered at Gloucester, where

[1] Thurloe, vii. 722.

[2] *Clarke Papers*, iv. 40 ; *Commons' Journals*, vii. 723, 760 ; *Cal. State Papers, Dom.* 1659-60, pp. 121, 146, 195, 197.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 307, 322, 349, 352, 368, 415, 592 ; *Report on the MSS. of Mr. Leyborne Popham*, p. 174.

Cochrane levied money upon the district for the support of his soldiers, and otherwise behaved in a despotic fashion. After the restoration of the authority of Parliament Cochrane was cashiered, a new colonel was appointed, and six companies of the regiment were ordered to return to Dunkirk (Jan. 14 1660).[1] Upon this both officers and men mutinied, and the new colonel narrowly escaped with his life. They 'besieged their colonel in his chamber, threatening to kill him,' and sent a deputation to Monck representing the injustice of sending them out of England unpaid. Monck succeeded in quelling the mutiny, and the regiment seems to have been disbanded in February 1660.[2] A certain number of the privates, however, were probably sent to Flanders, and used to recruit the regiments forming the garrison of Dunkirk.[3]

Meanwhile the regiments left behind at Dunkirk had been going through an unpleasant ordeal. In England the Parliament, as soon as the Revolution of May 1659 had established it in power, proceeded to appoint seven commissioners to go through the army lists, and to remove all officers suspected of hostility to the republic, immorality, or religious views of a wrong shade, and to replace them by more satisfactory men. About August 1659 the process of purgation was applied to the garrison of Dunkirk. Ashfield, Packer, and Pearson, the three parliamentary commissioners, reported very unfavourably about the character of the garrison. 'Here does want a person to command the garrison whose principle it is to encourage godliness in the power thereof. We have cause to fear that profaneness and wickedness (which do sadly abound in this place) will do more to the loss and prejudice thereof than all other enemies.'[4] Besides this, informations were sent in to the committee for

[1] *Cal. State Papers, Dom.* 1659-60, pp. 300, 309, 321.

[2] Guizot, *Richard Cromwell*, translated by Scoble, ii. 341, 343; *Publick Intelligencer*, January 30–February 6, 1660, p. 1068.

[3] On February 6 the Council of State ordered that 600 men of the regiment late Sir Bryce Cochrane's should be conducted to Dunkirk, but there is no evidence that the order was carried out. (*Cal. State Papers, Dom.* 1659 60, p. 343.)

[4] Thurloe, vii. 695.

the nomination of officers accusing the officers of the Dunkirk regiments of all kinds of crimes. Colonel Alsop, it was asserted, was 'an active man as a soldier, but an enemy to religion and godliness, especially in the sincerity of it.' Colonel Lillingston was just as bad, 'a mere soldier, who thinketh religion altogether useless in military discipline, or else he would not cherish such a crew of wicked officers as he doth.' Their subordinates fared as badly. Summing up Alsop's regiment the informer asserted: 'There are not above six commission officers in this regiment but are guilty of whoreing, swearing, or drinking, besides false musters;' while of Lockhart's own foot he declared 'all the lieutenants and ensigns in this regiment, except three or four, are guilty of drunkenness besides other vices.' Anecdotes illustrating the character of the officers mentioned enlivened the accusations.[1]

Lillingston and Alsop became aware of these charges and of the intended changes, and wrote vigorously several times to the Council of State protesting against the calumnies which were circulated about themselves and their subordinates, by 'flatterers and designers and such as put on a cloak of religion to conceal their own unworthiness.' 'We cannot conceal,' said they, 'the great regret we have to understand, that divers officers here, by some unworthy persons, have been traduced to your honours, though we know them to be men that have all along served you faithfully and cordially. We cannot believe that your honours will be ready to believe detractors, but rather to credit our testimony; for we assure you, that if we did conceive or suspect any officer of this garrison not fit for his command, either in respect of his fidelity or conversation, we should be most ready, according to our duty, to inform your honours; but truly we believe there are not in all your armies men that have demeaned themselves with more fidelity, courage, and modesty, both in England and here, wherein those that backbite them have been wanting too apparently.'[2]

The burden of preserving Dunkirk and keeping in order

[1] See Appendix A.

[2] *Thurloe Papers*, vii. 723, 729, 730.

a garrison whose pay was always behindhand fell upon Colonels Alsop and Lillingston, for during the summer and autumn of 1659 Lockhart was absent on a diplomatic mission, having been sent to watch the negotiations which resulted in the treaty of the Pyrenees. Both officers were energetic and zealous, in spite of the discouragements they received from the government in England. They had a high idea of the importance of Dunkirk, and were determined to preserve it. 'If we have not these supplies and the other necessaries,' says one of these letters to the Council of State, 'we cannot answer what you may perhaps expect of us, though we perish in the defence of this place, which our ambition and desire is to perpetuate to our nation, as a goad in the sides of their enemies, and to secure our footing in the Continent of Europe, lost since Queen Mary's days, and now regained; and doubtless we ought to preserve that carefully, which the Lord hath given us so graciously.'[1]

In spite of the truce, both France and Spain had their eyes on Dunkirk, and its possession was the object of constant intrigues. Nevertheless, throughout all the changes which took place during the autumn and winter of 1659 the garrison remained faithful and its officers vigilant. Lockhart returned to his command at Dunkirk in December 1659, some three weeks before the collapse of the army's attempt to govern England. He and the regiments under his command hailed with satisfaction the second restoration of the Long Parliament, and his letter of congratulation was read in the House on January 3, 1660.[2] Many efforts had been made to win him over to the King's cause, and Major-General Middleton, his old comrade in arms, had been employed in the negotiation, but without success. Mazarin, according to Clarendon, had promised to make Lockhart a Marshal of France, and to give him pensions and other emoluments, if he would deliver Dunkirk into French hands.[3] Lockhart

[1] Thurloe, vii. 729.

[2] *Commons' Journals*, viii. 803; *Merc. Polit.* p. 1002. See Appendix B.

[3] Clarendon, *Rebellion*, xvi. 173, ed. Macray.

remained inaccessible to all temptations to betray his trust, and faithful to whatever government represented England for the time being. His soldiers, like most Englishmen, regarded the recall of Charles II. as the only expedient which would put an end to confusion and anarchy. Pepys notes in his *Diary*, under April 1, 1660, that he was told by an officer of the garrison that 'the soldiers at Dunkirk do drink the King's health in the streets.'[1] On May 8 following Colonel Lillingston presented an address to Monck on behalf of the garrison, in which they declared their acquiescence in the King's restoration and expressed their loyalty.[2] This closed Lockhart's government. As soon as the King landed he appointed Colonel Edward Harley governor in Lockhart's stead, in order, it was calumniously said, that the town might not fall into the hands of the French. Harley had been a colonel in the New Model until 1647, when he sided with the Parliament against the Army; he was now member for Herefordshire, and on May 31, 1660, the House of Commons granted him leave of absence 'in regard to his public employment in his Majesty's service as governor of Dunkirk, which he is now attending.'[3] His formal commission as governor is dated July 14, 1660. About the same time he became colonel of the regiment of foot which had been Lockhart's, whilst Lockhart's regiment of horse was given to Robert Harley, the governor's brother.[4] Alsop and Lillingston retained their commands for the present, but in both their regiments, as in the two others, a number of officers who were regarded as dangerous or disloyal were replaced by men whose principles were above suspicion.[5] All four regiments escaped

[1] Pepys, ed. Wheatley, p. 104.

[2] Scott, *British Army*, iii. 113, quoting *Mercurius Publicus*, May 16–23, 1660.

[3] *Commons' Journals*, viii. 52; cf. Guizot, *Richard Cromwell*, ii. 428, 437; *Portland MSS.* iii. 222.

[4] Collins, *History of the Noble Families of Cavendish, Holles, Harley*, &c. p. 202.

[5] For a list of the regiments and their officers see *Mercurius Publicus*, August 23–30, 1660.

the great disbanding of the English army in the autumn of 1660, for it was necessary to retain a garrison at Dunkirk, and Parliament, which had passed an Act for annexing Dunkirk in perpetuity to the English Crown, was willing to supply money for its maintenance.[1]

What the cost of the garrison at that moment was it is a little difficult to ascertain. On June 29 Sir Edward Harley petitioned the House of Commons that an establishment for Dunkirk might be fixed. On August 24 Sir Thomas Clarges reported from the committee appointed to consider the subject, that the garrison should consist of 3,600 foot, being two regiments of 1,800 apiece, and of one regiment of horse consisting of 432 men. The draft of an establishment for this purpose was brought in, and a bill for its enactment read a first time, but it may be doubted whether it was passed.[2] The government of King Charles had on its hands in Flanders not only the Cromwellian soldiers who garrisoned Dunkirk, but their old adversaries, the remnant of the little army raised in 1657 by the King and defeated at the battle of the Dunes. To reduce gradually the number of these Cromwellian soldiers, to replace them by these royalist soldiers, and to amalgamate the two to form a garrison for Dunkirk, was the King's policy. It is necessary, therefore, to consider the condition in which the Restoration found this second army.

IV

In spite of the disaster which befell the King's little army at the battle of the Dunes it continued to exist, and eventually he got together again a considerable number of men. 'The King's troops,' wrote Lord Bristol to Sir Edward Nicholas, about a fortnight after that battle, 'come together again better than was expected, except the King's own regiment,

[1] *Commons' Journals*, viii. 163.

[2] *Ibid.* viii. 77, 135. An establishment for Dunkirk is given in Lister's *Life of Clarendon*, iii. 510, but it belongs to 1661 or 1662. Monck's computation of the cost of the garrison is given in a paper printed at p. 212 of the same volume.

which is totally lost.'[1] The French officers guarded their prisoners very carelessly, and allowed them to ransom themselves, if they were able, on easy terms. The officer to whom Captain John Gwynne and four other officers of the King's guard had surrendered, not only gave them an excellent meal, but finally let them go upon their own parole for half the usual ransom.[2] Others were less fortunate, and remained prisoners till the summer of 1659. Percy Church, writing to Hyde from Paris on June 20, observes that 'the King's poor officers' there were to be set at liberty next day, on signing a paper to surrender in case the treaty between France and Spain should not take effect. Their condition, however, was most miserable, for they had no clothes but those they were taken prisoners in, and were threatened with imprisonment by their landlords for former debts.[3] The condition of the officers and men who were at liberty was sometimes little better, especially after the truce made between France and Spain in May 1659 had rendered their possible services of no value to the Spaniards. Their pay was small if they received it, and they received it so rarely that they were often in danger of starvation. Captain Gwynne tells strange stories of the shifts to which they were put, and expatiates on the difficulty he had in keeping any men together.

'Some of my souldiers one morning came to me grievously sharpe set, and in that hungry humour sadly complained of the hard measure they had, as to be forst to beg, steale, or starve, which was not allways to be don, nor would they do it any longer; vowing that it was for my sake they staid there so long languishing at that rate. I could not take any thing ill that eas'd them with talking, becaus, to be sure, whatsoever they beg'd, stoale, or made a shift for, I had my share of it, or I might have gon and do as they did, or not live; therefore I seem'd to comply with them to gaine their patience but to the next day; and, in the mean

[1] *Clarendon MSS.* [2] *Military Memoirs of John Gwynne*, pp. 109–112.
[3] *Clarendon MSS.*

time, I would fix upon something commendable for us all to do in so great an exigence ; and so prevail'd with them.'[1]

Next day, therefore, he made a speech to them, explaining that he knew as well as they did what starving meant.

'You all know very well, that not long since I was in quarters, with Collonol Careles his lieutenant, and others, and truly we had no other choyce for our Christmas-day dinner, then a well-grown young fat dog, as cleanly drest, and as finely roasted, as any man need put into his belly. And we had no need to complaine, since we had any thing to feed upon as was man's meat ; nor need you want such novelty now and then, if you do but looke well about ye when you go abroad a preying, whilst there is a care taken for a better accommodation for us. In the mean time, let's all resolve, with a brave old saying, "What can not be cur'd, must be endur'd;" for we come here to live and dye in the King's service without scrupling ; but, like gentlemen and souldiers,

> We'l here in point of honour starve, and try
> How long we'l pine with hunger ere we dye.'[2]

About the winter of 1658 or the spring of 1659 the King's army was reorganised.[3] The death of Cromwell in September 1658, and the evident instability of Richard's authority, roused fresh hopes amongst the Royalists, and while a new plot for a general insurrection was set on foot in England an attempt was made to get together sufficient troops in Flanders to justify a landing on the English coast to assist the rising. By July 1659 the King once more had six regiments, at all events on paper : the King's own, the Duke of York's, the Duke of Gloucester's, Lord Newburgh's, Colonel Grace's, and Colonel Farrell's. The largest was the

[1] *Military Memoirs of John Gwynne*, p. 132.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 133. Gwynne gives no dates, but says that this took place when they were quartered at Nivelles. It may have happened just before the king's restoration or just afterwards.

[3] See the correspondence quoted in Hamilton's *History of the Grenadier Guards*, i. 29–30.

Duke of York's, which consisted of nineteen companies ; the smallest that of Newburgh, which had only ten. In all there were eighty-six companies, from which it might be inferred that there were between 2,000 and 3,000 men.[1] But the lower number is much more probable.

In August 1659 the rising headed by Sir George Booth gave the opportunity the King waited for. Marshal Turenne offered to provide the Duke of York with arms, provisions and ships for an expedition to England, and to put at his disposal 2,000 French soldiers for the purpose. He urged that the King's troops in Flanders should be directed to march to Boulogne, where he would find vessels for them to embark in. James joyfully accepted, but the obstructiveness of the Spanish governor of the Netherlands frustrated the attempt. On returning to Brussels he found 'that notwithstanding the Duke of Gloucester had delivered to the Marquis of Caracena the letters which his Royal Highness had written from Boulogne for the marching of his troops to St. Omer, yet the marquis would not permit them to stir out of their quarters, though he was sufficiently pressed to it by the Duke of Gloucester. But he still answered, he did not believe Mr. de Turenne durst let them pass through any part of his King's dominions without order, which he knew he could not have. Nor would he suffer to draw down to the sea side, to which he was also urged by the Duke of Gloucester when he found he could not obtain his first point.'[2] Other French officers, Schomberg for instance, the governor of Calais, were equally willing to aid the projected invasion of England ; but Mazarin, whilst allowing underhand assistance to be given, would sanction no overt action likely to lead to a breach with the English republic, till the peace between

[1] *Report on the MSS. of Mr. Eliot Hodgkin*, p. 125. Grace's regiment is evidently that once called Ormond's, Farrell's probably Bristol's. According to Hamilton, who, as usual, does not give his authority, the King had at the commencement of 1660 about 2,000 men in Flanders (*Grenadier Guards*, i. 32). In May 1659 the King said he would bring 2,000 men with him (*Clarendon S.P.* iii. 472).

[2] *Life of James II.* i. 379 ; Lister, *Life of Clarendon*, i. 464.

France and Spain was finally completed.[1] The Spanish government, on the other hand, was lukewarm,[2] and ready to throw over the cause of the Stuarts for the sake of peace with England. Throughout the troubles of 1659, therefore, Charles II. could make no use of his little army, and when the Restoration took place it was scattered in different parts of Flanders, not collected into a body in any single place. As the Spanish government naturally declined to continue their pay, and referred them to their own sovereign, their case was for a few months worse than ever. Charles did not bring them back to England with him, nor did he send for them after his arrival and his installation. By degrees, however, they were drawn to Dunkirk, and were either incorporated in the garrison or otherwise provided for. The Duke of York's life guard fared best, for by vote of the House of Commons on July 1, 1660, it was added to the establishment of Dunkirk. It consisted, according to the vote, of 100 men besides officers.[3] The troop did not remain there more than six or seven months. Venner's insurrection, which took place in December 1660, showed that more forces were needed in England for the security of the public peace, and Monck recommended that the Duke of York's troop should be brought over. This was accordingly done, and it was added to the establishment of the army in England as one of the three troops of the Life Guards.[4]

The next to be brought on the establishment was the King's Regiment of Guards. On August 26, 1660, Lord Wentworth was appointed its colonel.[5] Thereupon the officers

[1] Carte, *Original Letters*, ii. 269–276; Chéruel, *Ministère de Mazarin*, iii. 289–393. [2] Carte, ii. 215, 230, 253, 258, 260.

[3] On June 13 the Duke of York petitioned the Privy Council that his troop, 'at present in the King of Spain's dominions, might be drawn into and provided for in his Majesty's town and garrison of Dunkirk.' (Scott, *British Army*, iii. 116.) For the vote of the Commons see *Journals* viii. 77, 78. See also *MSS. of the Duke of Portland*, iii. 242, 244, 246.

[4] Scott, iii. 65, 80, 116; *Life of James II.* i. 391; Dalton, *Army Lists*, i. 2.

[5] Hamilton says that the commission to Wentworth describes the regiment a being at Dunkirk, but it certainly was not there till later. (*History of the Grenadier Guards*, i. 75–77.)

of the regiment, which was then quartered at Nivelles, sent him a letter representing their hard case. 'We are scarcely left one part of four who at Dunkirk battle entirely devoted themselves to be sacrificed for our King's sake, rather than deceive his reposed confidence in the resolve of his too few (at that time) loyal subjects. But having escaped the worst, beyond our hope, as to be prisoners, three parts of us perished with a tedious imprisonment and want of bread, and the few remainder here languish as having no allowance to live.'[1] No answer came for a time, and the regiment was removed to Namur for its winter quarters. There their condition was no better. Caracena, the Spanish governor of the Netherlands, sent orders to magistrates 'that they were to give them no other accommodation than vacant houses upon the rampart and courts of guard, and that [they were] to expect their own subsistence from their own King, being restored to three kingdoms.'[2] The officers drew up a petition to be sent to Lieutenant-Colonel Wheeler for presentation to the King, and early in 1661 they appear to have received orders to march for Dunkirk. A series of warrants for providing arms, uniforms, and colours to the regiment, show that it was re-organised and re-equipped at Dunkirk between March and October 1661.[3] It was to consist of twelve companies of 100 men apiece, and Lord Wentworth was authorised to raise 1,100 recruits to complete its complement.[4] Throughout Lord Teviot's governorship it continued to form part of the garrison, and apparently lived on the best of terms with the officers and men of the Cromwellian regiments already occupying the place.[5] On the sale of Dunkirk to France in November 1662, Rutherford received orders to transport the King's guards to England, and from November 19, 1662, they were mustered as part of the English establishment.[6] Finally,

[1] *Memoirs of John Gwynne*, p. 127. [2] *Ibid.* p. 129.
[3] *Cal. State Papers, Dom.* 1660–1, p. 332.
[4] Cf. Scott, *History of the British Army*, iii. 117, 118. [5] See Appendix C.
[6] *Cal. S.P., Dom.* 1661–2, p. 545; Clifford Walton, *History of the British Standing Army*, pp. 5, 843; Scott, iii. 216, 220.

on Wentworth's death in February 1665, the regiment was amalgamated with the King's Regiment of Foot Guards which Charles had raised in England in February 1661.[1] The united corps, consisting now of twenty-four companies, is represented by the First Grenadier Guards.

It remained now to provide for the Irish regiments, viz. those of the Duke of York, the Duke of Gloucester, Colonel Grace, and Colonel Farrell, and the Scottish regiment of Lord Newburgh, which probably numbered among them about 1,700 or 1,800 men. They all seem to have been assembled about Mardyke in the spring of 1661. A letter from Sir Edward Harley to the Duke of Albemarle, dated May $\frac{1}{2}\frac{8}{8}$, described their situation, and expressed some fear of an attack upon them from the Spaniards.

He had consulted with the Irish officers at Mardyke about their removal near to Dunkirk. Their opinion was that unless the necessity were urgent, 'their troops will be much incommoded when they shall be in so narrow a room as they must be if they remove under the town walls, for although there are not in the troops above 1,600 effective men, yet there are many more women and children, who take up much room.' . . .

He considered that 'the troops will be of more service at Mardyke to countenance the new works upon Fort Lyon side, and if the Spaniards will attempt to fall upon the Irish at Mardyke, then it is much more likely that the Spaniards will possess Mardyke, and make a quarter there; besides I must freely acquaint your Grace, that I very much doubt when the Irish and English come so near together they will not agree so well as at this distance.'

His information was that the Spaniards were drawing all their strength to Nieuport, Furne, Hondsdroote, and Bergues, where several troops were expected that day.[2]

After Rutherford had succeeded Harley as governor these

[1] Scott, *History of the British Army*, iii. 83, 235.

[2] *Report on the MSS. of Mr. Leyborne Popham*, p. 189. See also *Report on the MSS. of the Duke of Portland*, iii. 255.

regiments were reorganised, and a number of superfluous officers dismissed. This took place in the winter of 1661–2.[1] The Duke of York's regiment, consisting of 1,000 men, was placed upon the establishment of Dunkirk about March 1662, or perhaps earlier, being then and later under the command of Lord Muskerry.[2] Yet it was not for some time actually quartered in Dunkirk. 'I was at Mardyke,' wrote an English traveller in May 1662, 'the houses whereof being burnt down I saw not above six standing. A regiment of Irish, being the Duke of York's, keep a camp there, in huts made of sods.'[3] As the regiment was entirely Irish there was no thought of incorporating it in the English army. Accordingly, in November 1662, the instructions sent to Rutherford for the disposal of the garrison of Dunkirk upon the sale of the place to France declared that the duke's regiment was to enter the French service.[4]

The Duke of Gloucester's regiment was, like the Duke of York's, long quartered at Mardyke. As Gloucester died in September 1660, his regiment, which was now commanded by William Viscount Taaffe, had no influential person at court to represent its necessities, and suffered greatly during its sojourn at Mardyke.[5] Petitions show that a number of officers were dismissed during the winter of 1661–2, and a warrant for the payment of the regiment in December 1661 shows that it nominally consisted of 500 men besides officers.[6] Probably the real number was much smaller than this, for the regiment was of so little significance that when Dunkirk was sold to

[1] *Cal. S.P., Dom.* 1661–2, pp. 249, 287.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 8, 41, 313, 409, 469, 492; Lister, *Life of Clarendon*, iii. 510. It apparently succeeded Robert Harley's on the Dunkirk establishment.

[3] Kennet, *Register Ecclesiastical and Civil*, p. 717.

[4] Scott, *British Army*, iii. 216; *Cal. S.P., Dom.* 1661–2, pp. 545, 608, 632.

[5] On its sufferings see *Cal. State Papers, Dom.* 1660–1, p. 173; *ibid.* 1661–2, p. 222.

[6] *Ibid.* 1660–1, p. 433; 1661–2, pp. 167, 194, 249, 261, 364. The officers who were reduced were granted certain sums out of the money assigned for the payment of the 500 soldiers at which the strength of the regiment was fixed. Many only 389 men were actually on the muster rolls.

France the government forgot to issue any orders about its disposal. When it was reminded of this omission it sent an order to Lord Taaffe, dated Nov. 28, 1662, ordering him to disband the regiment at once. It was accordingly disbanded at Mardyke.[1]

The rest of the old royalist regiments in Flanders were utilised to garrison Tangiers, which had just come into English hands. In November 1661 two small Irish regiments were shipped from Dunkirk to Tangiers. One was that of Colonel Farrell, which, as was before stated, probably represented that originally known as Lord Bristol's. When it was mustered at Tangiers on January 30, 1662, just after its arrival, it numbered only 381 men, and it was finally incorporated in the old Tangiers regiment, afterwards the Second Queen's, and now known as the West Surrey.[2]

With it at the same time sailed Colonel John Fitzgerald's regiment, whose earlier history I have not succeeded in tracing. It arrived at Mardyke, coming from Beauvais, in March 1661, and was ordered on June 17 following to be reduced into ten companies. It numbered 395 men on arriving at Tangiers, and, like Farrell's, was finally incorporated in the old Tangiers regiment.[3] John Fitzgerald, its colonel, became deputy-governor (January 1663) and lieutenant-governor (1664–6) of Tangiers, played an important part in its early history, and was granted in 1664 an annuity of 500*l.* for his faithful services there.[4]

A third regiment, that of Colonel Richard Grace, once Ormond's, disappears altogether about this time, and was probably either disbanded or reduced into one of the other Irish regiments. In November 1661 a warrant issued for two months' pay for the regiment describes it as consisting

[1] *Cal. State Papers, Dom.* 1661–2, pp. 553, 573, 607.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 129, 287, 288; Davis, *History of the Second Queen's Regiment*, i. 27, 31, 41, 49.

[3] *Cal. State Papers, Dom.* 1661–2, pp. 10, 129, 136, 161, 288–9; Davis, i. 27, 31, 41, 49, 65, 69, 71.

[4] *Cal. State Papers, Dom.* 1661–2, p. 588; Davis, pp. 43, 54, 72, 82; *Pepys's Diary*, ed. Wheatley, iii. 102, iv. 271, 306, viii. 746.

only of 80 men, and after this it is no more heard of.[1] Grace himself, whose services were not unrewarded, died fighting for James II. at the siege of Athlone in 1691.[2]

To complete the history of the six royalist regiments it only remains to narrate what befell Lord Newburgh's regiment of Scots. In December 1660 it was quartered at Douai, and its officers, having sold or pawned all they had, were in a starving condition. According to their petition to Charles, they had received no rations of bread for the last six months, and no pay for the last six months except 5 florins apiece which the King sent them, and were all in the greatest distress.[3] They were moved to Mardyke in the spring of 1661, and in the following December the regiment was reduced to two companies and incorporated in one of the Irish regiments. His Majesty, complained Rutherford, the unwilling agent in effecting this reduction, having so many English regiments, and four Irish ones, might have kept 'one poor Scots regiment.' Newburgh himself had his reward, being made commander of a troop of horse which was established in Scotland, but the rank and file got nothing but the opportunity of leaving their bones in Africa.[4]

Leaving the royalist regiments, let us turn to the history of the Cromwellian regiments which shared with them the duty of holding Dunkirk. It has been shown that in August 1660 these regiments were four in number, viz. :—the regiment of foot commanded by the governor, Sir Edward Harley, which had been Lockhart's regiment, those of Colonel Alsop and Colonel Lillingston, and Colonel Robert Harley's regiment of horse, formerly Lockhart's. When Rutherford succeeded Sir Edward Harley as governor, which took place

[1] *Cal. State Papers, Dom.* 1661–2, pp. 161, 287, 288.

[2] Grace was rewarded by being granted the sale of a baronetcy (*ibid.* p. 270). He survived to take part in the Irish wars which followed the Revolution and to defend Athlone against the troops of William III. (Dalton, *Army List of King James II.* ii. 567.)

[3] *Cal. State Papers, Dom.* 1660–1, p. 415; 1661–2, pp. 287, 288.

[4] *Camden Miscellany*, vol. viii., 'Letters addressed to the Earl of Lauderdale,' p. 22.

in May 1661, Harley's regiment of foot passed under his command.[1] Eighteen months later, when Dunkirk was sold to the French, the regiment was disbanded.[2] Some of its officers subsequently became part of the garrison of Tangiers. Rutherford, or, to give him his higher title, the Earl of Teviot, to which rank he succeeded in February 1663, was appointed governor of Tangiers on April 9, 1663, and was killed in an ambuscade by the Moors on May 4, 1664.[3] With him perished also Major Knightley, major of his old regiment, who had accompanied him from Dunkirk. Another officer of the same regiment, Lieutenant-Colonel Henry Norwood, became on February 21, 1666, Lieutenant-Governor of Tangiers, and continued to hold that post till 1669.[4]

The history of Lillingston's regiment is less easy to trace, because the changes which took place during 1660 and 1661 are not properly recorded. Lillingston lost his commission about the beginning of 1661, and was succeeded by Sir Robert Harley, the governor's brother. In a muster dated February 11, Lillingston appears as colonel of one of the three regiments of foot, and Robert Harley as colonel of the only regiment of horse. In another dated April 8, Sir Robert Harley appears as colonel of a foot regiment, and the six troops of horse are mustered without a colonel, while Lillingston's name has disappeared.[5] In December 1661 Harley's regiment of foot was sent to Tangiers, and landed there in January 1662 with a strength of 947 men.[6] The Earl of Peterborough, then governor of Tangiers, wrote to Harley, whom illness prevented from accompanying his men: 'You have here come under my inspection, a regiment of the most estimable I have

[1] This is proved by comparing the list of officers in Harley's regiment in 1660 with the list of Rutherford's in 1662, and noting the changes made in 1661. (Dalton, *Army Lists* i. 18, 19, 24.)

[2] *Cal. State Papers, Dom.* 1661–2, p. 545.

[3] Davis, *History of the Second Queen's Regiment*, pp. 36, 63.

[4] Davis, i. 82, 99; Dalton, . 18.

[5] *Report on the MSS. of the Duke of Portland*, iii. 247, 250.

[6] Davis, *History of the Second Queen's Regiment*, pp. 27, 31, 42; *Cal. State Papers, Dom.* 1661–2, 194, 312, 376.

known, and that is governed by sober, able, and discreet officers.'[1] It bore the brunt of the fighting there for the next twelve months, losing nearly 400 men in the year, including, it seems, both Maurice Kingwell, its lieutenant-colonel, and Major George Fiennes. Finally it was about October 1663 reduced into the governor's regiment, and so helped to form the Second Queen's.[2]

Alsop's regiment had a less eventful career than that of Lillingston, though its colonel achieved greater fame. About April 1661 he lost the nominal command of it, which passed first to Lord Ossory, and about three months later to Lord Falkland.[3] Alsop became lieutenant-colonel of the regiment, and continued to act in that capacity as long as it existed. Many other officers of the regiment were either superseded by royalists, and degraded a step in order to make room for them, or dismissed altogether.[4] The regiment

[1] *Portland MSS.* iii. 259. [2] Davis, i. 33, 41, 49.

[3] The last mention of Alsop's regiment amongst the *Harley Papers* is dated February 11, 1661; the first mention of Ossory's is in April. *Report on the Duke of Portland's MSS.* iii. 247, 250, 251. Notes of commissions in which officers lately belonging to Alsop's regiment are replaced by others commissioned as of Lord Falkland's prove the connection between the two regiments. (*Cal. State Papers, Dom.* 1660-1, 443; 1661-2, i. 124, 195, 325; *Mercurius Publicus*, August 23-30, 1660.)

[4] A petition to Monck from the officers at Dunkirk shows that they expected disbanding, and only desired to be paid their arrears first. Probably they obtained them.

'The Officers at Dunkirk to the Duke of Albemarle

'1661, May.—You having been a father to your country, and more particularly to us of this garrison, God having raised you up to accomplish those things in the restoration of our Lord and master, his most sacred Majesty, to his rights, which we all constantly and passionately desired, but had not the possibility to effect but by your conduct, we implore you to mediate with the King that no officer or soldier of the troops or companies of this garrison may be cashiered or put out of their employment without first having their arrears paid.

'*Signed by* Colonel Roger Alsop, Lieutenant-Colonels Maurice Kingwell and William Fleetwood, and 47 others.'

(*Report on the MSS. of Mr. Leyborne Popham*, p. 189.) Kingwell, who was Alsop's lieutenant-colonel, seems to have been removed to make room for his former colonel when Ossory took the command. He was, apparently, made lieutenant-colonel of Sir Robert Harley's foot, while Fleetwood was dismissed altogether.

itself came to an end in November 1662, being disbanded on the sale of Dunkirk to the French.[1]

The later history of its old colonel is worth recording. On October 23, 1662, Charles II. wrote to Alsop personally, telling him that he was parting with Dunkirk, but lest he should think his services forgotten the King assured him of his esteem, and promised to give evidence of it when opportunity should offer.[2] Alsop accompanied Teviot to Tangiers in 1663, and became town major of the garrison. When Teviot was killed by the Moors in May 1664, a meeting of officers offered the command to Alsop, but he declined on account of sickness. 'My own ability,' he says, 'caused me to decline the command of the place, though of due it fell to me.' He accepted, however, a little later the post of lieutenant-colonel to Colonel Henry Norwood. 'I have solely devoted myself,' he wrote to Sir Richard Fanshaw, 'to do his Majesty the best service that lieth in the power of my declining age. I do duly consider all that I can do will be too little to redeem the time that I have lost when I was more able to serve his Majesty.'[3] A medal was given him from the King in 1665 as a mark of distinction. Alsop continued many years in Tangiers. In May 1676 he was joint governor with Sir Palmes Fairborne during Lord Inchiquin's absence in England, but on the ground of ill-health deputed the sole command to his colleague. He died about November 1676, having shown to a later generation the worth of the soldiers bred by Cromwell.[4]

Last of all comes the question, What became of the six troops of horse raised in 1658 as Lockhart's regiment, and becoming in August 1660 Sir Robert Harley's regiment? As has been shown already Harley ceased to be their colonel about April 1661. Many other changes took place amongst the officers, and all the Cromwellian troop commanders lost

[1] *Cal. State Papers, Dom.* 1661–2, pp. 525, 544–5.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 525.
[3] *Report on the MSS. of Mr. J. M. Heathcote*, pp. 157, 164. Davis, *History of the Second Queen's*, i. 44, 71, 74, 111, 115.

their commissions except Major Tobias Bridge. In April 1662 three troops of the regiment, commanded by Captain Michael Dungan, Captain Littleton, and Major Sir William Salkeld, were sent to Portugal, as part of the English contingent which was helping to win the independence of that country from Spain.[1] The three remaining troops remained at Dunkirk, and were disbanded in November 1662 when the place was sold to France.[2] Bridge, who was knighted about 1663, was at Tangiers in command of a troop of horse in the same year, and when Lord Teviot was killed the surviving officers of the garrison elected Bridge acting governor (May 1664). In that capacity he did his duty most admirably. Sir Richard Fanshaw, the English ambassador in Portugal, praised his 'unshakenness in mind' in this disaster, and the King sent him a medal and chain. Bridge returned to England in 1666, and was appointed in February 1667 colonel of a regiment of foot raised to serve in Barbados and the West Indies.[3]

In conclusion, to sum up this history of the two English armies which fought in Flanders, both are still represented in the British Army of to-day. One of the troops of the Life Guards is descended from the Duke of York's Life Guard, while the Grenadier Guards represent the regiment of Charles the Second's foot guards which fought at the battle of the Dunes. On the other hand, the Second Queen's or West Surrey, representing as it does the old Tangiers regiment, represents also the regiment raised by Colonel Lillingston in 1657, which fought in the same battle upon the other side. Like the Coldstream Guards, it can trace its descent to the Cromwellian army.

[1] *Cal. State Papers, Dom.* 1661–2, p. 344. [2] *Ibid.* p. 545.

[3] Davis, *History of the Second Queen's*, pp. 44, 64, 74, 83; Dalton, *Army Lists*, p. 75.

APPENDIX A.

A True Accounte of the Officers of Dunkirke.[1]

The Lord Lockhart's Regiment of Foote. [f. 85]

Major Hinton walking upon the mainguard with Leiut. Coll. Hayns, the said Leiut. Coll. putt his cane betweene his leggs, and caused him to stumble. And hee called Leiut. Coll. Haynes Foole, to which hee replyed, you peevish old fellow: whereby Major Hinton was soe provoked thatt hee swore, God dam mee I'le runn you thourough. To which the other answer'd with an oath as greate; if you draw I'le cleave you asunder. Furthermore 'tis very well knowne the said Major is an enimy to godly men: and a favourer of wicked and prophane persons; and being in the least crost, hee will sweare horribly.

Capt. Coates, a greate gamester; one thatt was formerly a Cavaleer, and 'tis evident doth still retaine the old principles, for his companions were those persons thatt were the dispersers of false money in this place; and there is greate reason to beleeve thatt hee is nott inocent of thatt crime, although some have indeavoured his vindication, butt time will make itt more manifest.

Capt. Willoughby, and towne major, a gamester, a drunkard, and a whoremunger, with whom itt is common to hazard a hundred poundes in one night: Likewise an associate of the false money-merchants, and if nott a confederate, yett a favourer of them. And further an eniemie to the present power, for upon the change hee declared openly for the Protector, and spake evilly of the army and their proceedings, calling them rogues, hee is a hater of godlynesse, and an eniemie to the proffessors of religion.

Capt. Devoe, a prophane, proud, and fantastickall man, and a notorious coward.

Capt. Gargrave, a notorious drunkard, whoremunger, and swearer, who (although his wife is present with him) keepeth a whore within few dores of his present quarters.

Capt. Muse, a meere sott, making itt the greatest parte of his bussines to bee drunke.

[1] *Rawlinson MS.* A, lxv. ff. 85, 69.

Davenporte, Ensigne to Capt. Riton, a horrible swearer, and as greate a whoremunger and drunkard, besides formerly a Cavaleer, and one thatt boasteth of his wicked practises.

Bromich, Ensigne to Capt. Coates, a very wicked, loose, and prophane person.

All the Leuitenants and Ensignes in this Regiment except three or foure are guilty of drunkenesse besides other vices.

[f. 86]

Coll. Lillinston's Regiment.

Coll. Lillingston, a meere souldier, who thinketh religion altogether uselesse in millitary discipline; or else hee would nott cherish such a crue of wicked officers as he doth, and support them in their wickednesse.

Leiut. Coll. Haynes, morehead then witt, who I doe beleeve was never preferred for his owne worth; a notorious lyar and a drunkard, a greate Protectorian; and was much dissatisfied att the late change. An envious person against all profession of godlynesse, who said his souldiers should nott goe to heare Mr. Gardiner preach, and did very much revile him.

Capt. Fitzwilliams, Governour of Mardike, a constant drunkard, one that was drunke twelve weekes together: a prophane wretch and malitious, for hee wished thatt hee had those Anabaptist rogues thatt turned out the Protector in his custody thatt he might dipp them in the Splinter.

Capt. Pogson, a notorious whoremunger, drunkard, and swearer, who kept a whore att Mardike untill he ketched the pox, and was forced to goe for England to bee cured, where he staied seven mounths; who when one of his souldiers was nott able to march, hee beeing desired to provide a cart for him, bid one returne and stripp of his clothes, and take his money, and leave him; furthurmore itt can bee proved thatt hee never made true muster since hee had this command. Richard Towsey, his Gentleman att Armes, having received severall wrongs from him did threaten him to article against him, who knowing his owne guilt durst nott venter upon a tryall, but complained of the said Gentleman att armes to the Collonell, who understanding the premises, persuaded Capt. Pogson to smother the bussines, for otherwise itt would bee his ruine; whereupon Collonel Lillinston sent for the Gentleman at Armes, and by threatning thatt hee would punish him if hee did exhibitt any articles, and promising him thatt hee desired should bee satisfied if hee did forbeare, he did therby divert his resolution, by this you may see how they fuggle together.

Capt. Brookes and Quartermaster South, formerly Cavaleers.

Leiut. Sherwood, formerly Ensigne to Capt. Fitzwilliams, a gamester, who being intrusted with Capt. Pogson's company Leiut. Scarfe being drowned, and to be leiutenant to thatt company, hee mustered sixteene men false at one muster, which was made appeare before my Lord Lockhart, which caused him to bee dismissed thatt imployment, and with threats of casheering, butt upon submission hee did retire to his former command; yett notwithstanding hee is since preferred to bee Leiutenant to Major Fines his company by Coll. Lillingston. [f. 87]

Good men are as scarse in this regiment as in any of the other.

The Regiment of Horse.

Capt. Nicols and Capt. Mills, two eminent drunkards, and only favourers of such who are their brethren in evill (viz.) pott companions; but extreme haters and persecutors of all honest, godly, and conscientious men.

Capt. Flower and Capt. Brett doe to the utmost of their power detaine the souldiers due from them: And if they act any justice or equity 'tis contrary to their wills: butt time will make their knavery more appeare.

The officers of horse are such for the greater number as dispise religion and the proffessors of itt; and give very evill examples to those under their command.

Dellavoll, Master of the Customs, a merchant and a privateer, by which meanes hee may more easily cheate the publick, and 'tis very well knowne he hath nott his trade to learne. And he is fitted with principles for the purpose, one of which is thatt he accounteth itt noe sinne to cosen the state. And thatt he may doe itt with more facility hee hath made his Brother Dyer a Clarke in the Customes: as very a knave as any in the Commonwealth, who I do beleive have acted their parts since their comming to Dunkirke: for Delavoll spends after the rate of 1000^{li} sterling a yeare, and Dyer after 2 or 300^{li} a yeare. And neither of these men before they came hither could bee trusted for triviall matters. They are both of them whoremungers, drunkards, and Cavalleers.

Coll. Alsop's Regiment. [f. 69]

Coll. Alsop, an active man as a souldier; butt an eniemie to religion and godliness, especially in the sincerity of itt: holding itt a thing altogether unnecessary for a souldier to minde, and therfore

doth discountenance the apearance of religion in all persons under his command, itt is nott long since thatt Mr. Gardiner [1] beeing by Providence in this place, hee was appointed by the Lord Lockhart to bee Chaplain to Coll. Alsop's regiment : but they refused to entertaine him : saying thatt hee was an Anabaptist, and deserved to bee turned out of towne : and had they nott beene prevented they would have beene as good as their words : Butt his Excellency the Lord Lockhart, beeing sufficiently satisfied of his ability and honesty, tooke him to bee his owne chaplin. Itt is and hath been a greife to the spirits of godly men to see prophanesse and ungodlynesse soe much incouraged in this place : butt especially the abuse of the Lord's day : for [the] inhabitants did make a markett day of itt in crying and selling their fish : whereupon an honest godly man did make complaint of itt to Coll. Alsop : intreating him to make use of his power in remediing these thinges, and for the better observance of the Lord's day. To which hee replyed thatt the trade of the towne must nott bee spoyled. And if hee or any man else in this place were soe straite laced that they could nott endure such thinges, they might depart the towne. This was done in the Generall's absence.

Leiut. Coll. Kingwell a greate courtier, and a Protectorian ; who being requested to speake in the behalfe of an honest man, denied itt ; saying thatt hee was an Anabaptist, and therfore should nott have his good worde : he sufficiently manefested his enmity against Mr. Gardiner by indeavouring to render him odious to all persons. Hee is a proud imperious spirited man, who commonly calleth his souldiers doggs. A bitter and an inveterate enimie to religion and the proffessors of itt, who with Coll. Alsop and many other great officers in this place did declare themselves dissatisfied with the late change in England, using very opprobrious language of this present power, and were itt nott for advantage would not have complyed with them.

Capt. Withers and Capt. Cobham, two famous drunkards, all
[f. 70] times being alike to them : wether upon duty or nott, for itt is very well knowne they have beene often drunke upon the guard, and being captain of the watch could scarsly goe the round. These are likewise enimies to religion because itt did condemne their evill courses.

Bassett, Leiutenant to Capt. Adderton, a Cavaleer, a gamester, and a drunkard.

There are nott above six commission officers in this regiment butt whatt are guilty of whoreing, swearing, or drinking. Besides false musters.

[1] I suspect Mr. Gardiner of being the author of this denunciation.

Butt if Mr. Browne the muster-master were upright and just in his place these abominable false musters would bee prevented. Butt hee for a little private gaine doth greatly prejudice the publick.

APPENDIX B

Lockhart's Letter to the Parliament

A letter from Col. William Lockhart, Governor of Dunkirk, of December 31 was read.

'May it please your Honour,—This day by private letters I have received the joyful and acceptable news of the Parliaments re-entering upon the exercise of their authority; which I thought it my duty to communicate immediately to the officers and souldiers of your garrison in this place; and accordingly began with those of my own regiment, proceeding afterwards to the rest, and endeavouring to set it upon all their hearts, how extraordinary and almost miraculous the workings of God have been, in bringing to pass this your last return; and how happily advantageous it is likely to prove to all the three nations, and to each particular concerned therein. I can give testimony of the general acclamations, and all outward signs that could be rendered of absolute satisfaction in every man here; neither do I in the least wise question the consent of their hearts, with the sensible demonstrations of their tongues, and countenances, especially when I declared to them the many and singular encouragements they have formerly received from the Parliament; and that they cannot expect the like from any authority whatsoever; besides the consideration of their respective membership and incorporation with the bodies both civil and military under your command.

'We have (God be praised) during the late interval, continued faithful servants to the honor and interest of our country, and are at present in such a posture, as to fear nothing from abroad, being so well fortified at home.

'I was recalled from the prosecution of your commands at St. Jean de Luz, by the same power that ordered me thither; but finding the face of things changed at my return, and my self at a loss what to do, I was at last advised by some persons to discharge my self to those who took upon them the management of affairs at

that time, and did accordingly give them the best lights I could, whereby to discern the interest of the commonwealth in relation both to France and Spain; after which I forthwith betook myself to this place, to act here according to that trust which you had formerly reposed in me; and I hope my presence hath not been unserviceable. But if it shall be thought requisite, that I come over again to render you a more full account of my late negotiations abroad, I shall most willingly and cheerfully do it: in the meantime, till your farther directions, I shall proceed to use all care and diligence here, both for the orderly disposing of the garrison, and the vigorous opposing of the enemy, if occasion require; hoping that in a short time I shall receive the honour of your commands, which shall always find a ready and exact obedience in me, and all that are under my charge.

'I thought the great importance of this happy day would have its effects upon the spirits of our enemies round about us, as well as upon our own, though in a different manner: and therefore to express our joy, and to intimate unto them the just cause of their sadness, I have this night ordered all our great guns, both by sea and land, to proclaim our exaltation, and their disappointment.

'I shall daily pray that God would crown your counsels and endeavors with success, answerable to the honest and peaceable expectations of the nations under you; and do for my own part give my self up entirely to be disposed by you, as becomes him who is so really and without reserve,

'May it please your Honour,
Your Honor's most humble,
Faithful, and obedient Servant,
WILLIAM LOCKHART.

'Dunkirk: Decemb. 31, 1659.'

The House ordered thanks to the colonel and the rest of the officers in Dunkirk, and a letter of thanks is to be sent accordingly. (*Mercur. Polit.* No. 601, p. 1001, December 29 to January 5, 1659.)

APPENDIX C

Notices of the Fortifications of Dunkirk, 1661

'That great and famous souldier the noble Lord Rutherfort (who was ever to his Majesty most affectionately loyal) hath now took possession of the garrison of Dunkirk, hath viewed and examined all the stores, tried the granadoes &c., and upon a strict survey of the officers and souldiers, finds them twixt 6 and 7,000 men effective ; all stout and experienced souldiers, as their neighbours can testifie.' (*Mercurius Publicus*, No. 23, June 13–20, 1661.)

'*Dunkirk.* The souldiery here are highly satisfied with the Lord Retorfort their new governor, as being a person of such known experience in military affairs, and one that hath ever had a loyal affection to his Majesties service. His Majesties regiment here is almost fully compleated, consisting of twelve companies, and in each company one hundred men. The Governor hath used great care and diligence in setting the garrison ; he hath lately taken a view of all the houses in the town, to know perfectly of what capacity it is, and is now about parting the town into several cantons, to lodge the souldiery proportionably.' (*Mercurius Publicus*, No. 24, p. 384, June 20–27, 1661.)

'*Dunkirk, September* 7. The new fortifications are, by the vigilance and care of the Lord Retorfort our governor, effectually prosecuted, 300 being at work constantly ; the turf work is already begun, and the foundation of the great fort (which is raised to secure the haven) laid. The neighbouring parts did for a while refuse to pay contribution ; but since they found that his Lordship sent out parties, and fetch'd in such as refused it, they come in willingly, and pay their obedience to this garison.' (*Mercurius Publicus*, No. 34, p. 575, August 22–29, 1661.)

'*Dunkirk, May* 9 [1662]. The late storms at North-East have proved so averse to our best enterprises, that the officers and souldiers of this garrison, in a deep sense of their loyalty to his Majesty, and their noble desires to bare some share of that unspeakable care and toyle which day and night they behold in the person of the right honourable Lord Rutherford, his Majesties governor of this place, have voluntarily and unanimously resolv'd (and that without expectation of any other reward than the satisfaction of so

generous an action) to overpower those tempests by their united force and industry; and resist even those storms which for so many months past have put his Majesty to so great an expence. It was this consideration only that moved his Majesties Regiment of Guards to assent to the deputation of their vigilant commander, Colonel Wise, with all the rest of the officers, to the noble Lord Governour, desiring they might have some work to do for his Majesties service, which employment they would willingly undertake *gratis*, to express their thankfulness for his Majesties special care of that garrison. They were quickly seconded by a noble emulation of Col. John Legge, Lieut. Col. to H.R., who most chearfully desired the like. The Lord Governors own Regiment lost no time in their sollicitation to follow so noble an example of their fellow souldiers, which was as chearfully prosecuted by the Regiment of the right honourable Lord Viscount Falkland. The Troops of Horse, though last mentioned, went first to the work, with the train, and all other his Majesties subjects residing within the garrison. The Lord Governor (over-joyed to see this generous resentment in the officers and souldiers) sent Sir Bernard de Gomme, Engineer General, sufficiently known for his singular skill and practice in fortification, with Mr. Jessin, engineer of this place, a most laborious and ingenious person, to mark out work for them. Twas a pleasant prospect to see the commanders and officers march at the head of their companies, with drums beating, and every one of them a shovel on his shoulder, and their souldiers expressing great chearfulness in their expression, by dancing to the work. Here cannot be omitted the singular case of Col. Alsop (Lieut. Col. to the Lord Falkland's Regiment) who all his life having been bred a souldier, doth not only give orders for the works, but also over sees our brickery, where four millions of bricks are making. With him is Col. Heylin, Major to that Regiment, and a most assiduous person. Captain Langton hath the intendance of the Lord Governor's Regiment. On the other side of the harbour at Fort Lyon we have 500 men daily at work, where our store work is a noble sight. Col. Bridge and Lieutenant Col. Knightley are voluntarily overseers in that quarter, who spend the whole day in quickning the labourers in so deserving a work. Never subjects gave more demonstration of their zeal and affection for their master's service: and this hath made so great an impression on the spirits of the burghers, that tis expected they also will undertake some piece of work to express their fidelity and affection unto that Majesty, whose favour and protection to them they hope will

ever continue. His Majesty observing with great satisfaction this generous unexpected expedition of his works at Dunkirk (where all is *gratis* and nothing mercinary) hath graciously pleased to declare a more than common concern for the promoters and actors in so noble a design.' (*Mercurius Publicus*, No. 20, May 15 to May 22, 1662, pp. 307–309.)

Marmaduke Rawdon, who visited Dunkirk in July 1662, shortly before its sale to France, gives a lengthy description of his entertainment by Lord Rutherford and the officers of the garrison, adding incidentally the following description of the fortifications of the place:

'The next morninge they went to vizitt the Governour, my Lord Rutterford, who was very glad to see them, and went with them to shew them a cittadell he was makinge of sand heapes, which he had allmost brought to perfection, and was capable of lodginge a thousand soldiers; a place of much importance both to command the towne, to keepe itt in obedience, and likewisse to defend itt against an enemie; a worke carried on with much industry, 500 men being att worke every day; my lord being the chiefe overseer, being al summer longe up att five of the clocke in the morninge amongst them.'[1]

A description of the fortifications of Dunkirk, as they were a year later (just after its sale to France), is given in the travels of Philip Skippon, who visited the town in April 1663:[2]

'We went in a boat to a fort lately built by the English; but it is on the sand, which by some winds is so driven that you may walk over the walls. The English made two firm bulwarks which command the sea, and under them is a broad platform, and then a thick wall (not yet finished), and within the wall is a passage for the soldiers to stand in and shoot through; a trench round besides; beyond the fort towards the sea is another sand.

[1] *Life of Marmaduke Rawdon* (Camden Soc.), p. 93.
[2] Reprinted in *Churchill's Voyages*, vi. 363.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE IN WALES DURING THE MIDDLE AGES.

By E. A. LEWIS

Read April 23rd, 1903.

THE development of industry and commerce in Wales during the Middle Ages may be regarded from two points of view. On the one hand we are concerned with the gradual decay of the commerce carried on by the inhabitants of the western regions of tribal Britain, and on the other hand with the development of the national commerce of the modern Principality.

The departure of the Romans, and the incursions of the Anglo-Saxon settlers, mark a definite point in the breaking up of the commerce of Old Britain. Its external trade with the Continent suddenly ceased. The advance of the English and the subsequent withdrawal of the British tribes ultimately confined a number of these tribes, particularly the Silures and the Ordovices, to the Welsh district. It is with the commercial system of this Welsh remnant that our examination of the subject must begin.

The political history of Wales explains the story of Welsh commerce. Down to the Union it is the history of a country undergoing a gradual conquest. Racial antipathy frequently checks its economic progress,[1] and often influences the character of its commercial legislation.[2] The physical structure of the country and the economic condition of the people explain its especial features.

[1] See below, p. 137.

[2] See below, pp. 131, 162.

Covering an area of less than 7,500 square miles, Wales, in modern geographical parlance, is usually classed as one of the British uplands, posessing an extensive maritime border, with several navigable rivers, and remarkable for its pastures and mineral wealth.

Now these commercial assets had been sampled by the Briton and the Roman before the making of Wales.[1]

The Roman, coming later, excelled the Briton. He civilised the wild Silurian who used no coins.[2] Internal traffic was improved by the making of good roads,[3] and mining, not considerable in Wales during the British period,[4] assumed larger proportions under the Roman sway. Almost every county in Wales bears the trace of Roman mining operations.[5] The county historian of Monmouth claims a

[1] The history of Wales as a distinct principality begins with the battle of Chester, about 613.

[2] Traill's *Social England*, p. 21. Only two ancient British coins have been found in Wales (*The Coins of the Ancient Britons* (Evans), Supplement, pp. 433, 437). On the question of Welsh coinage, see below, p. 134, note 6.

[3] See Mr. F. Haverfield's map of Roman Britain (*Hist. Atlas*, ed. R. L. Poole, i. no. xv.). Cf. *Arch. Camb.* 3rd series, vi. 186.

[4] *Social England*, p. 86, and *British Mining* (J. Hunt), p. 20.

[5] Proofs of the successful working of Welsh copper mines by the Romans are found in the cakes of copper found 'impressed with a Roman stamp' in the celebrated Paris mines of Anglesea (*Arch. Camb.* 4th series, iii. 180), and in the elaborate Roman coins and mining tools found in and near the old Roman levels at Llanymynech, on the eastern border of Montgomery (*Powysland Club Collections*, xi. 186). Cinder-beds, accompanied with Roman coins, evince the early origin of iron furnaces at Miskin in Glamorgan (Hunt, *op. cit.* p. 44), as also at Caerleon (*The South Wales Coal Trade and its Allied Industries* (by C. Wilkins), p. 5), Monmouth, Hadnock (*Hist. of Monmouth* (Williams, D.), p. 67), and particularly in the Forest of Dean, the chief centre of the industry (Hunt, *op. cit.* p. 28). Cinder-heaps, the supposed refuse of old Roman bloomeries, have been found at Marteg, on the left bank of the Upper Wye, in Radnorshire (*Hist. of Agriculture &c. in S. Wales* (Davies, W.), ii. 452), and at Crickhowell and Llanfrynach in Breconshire (Jones's *Hist. of Breconshire*, pp. 538-9). Evidences of Roman lead-mining are chiefly confined to the North Welsh counties, especially to the district of the Decangi or Cangi tribe, corresponding to a parcel of the modern Flintshire (*Arch. Camb.* 3rd series, ii. 309). Curious hammers and tools as well as the massive hilt of a Roman sword testify to the ancient working of the Abergele mines in Denbigh (Hunt, *op. cit.* p. 39), as do the old vestiges of imperial mining at Llandudno and Caerhun (*Conovium*) in Carnarvonshire (*ib.* p. 29). A Roman and even a British genesis is claimed for the lucrative mines of Cardiganshire, but upon doubtful evidence (*Hist. of Agri-*

Roman origin for the Welsh fishing industry; 'the Roman,' he says, 'first drew the attention of the Briton to the trout and salmon of the Usk.'[1] Several of our Welsh towns, such as Carnarvon, Carmarthen, and Neath, flourish on or near the sites of old Roman towns. This is their only claim to Romanic origin. Town life had no attraction for the Cymric tribes. They were chiefly a pastoral and military people, whose social system was little affected by the Roman occupation.[2]

The scanty evidence to be gathered from the extant chronicles makes it quite clear that during the period following the Roman occupation warfare was the chiefest industry of the Cymric tribes, whilst they apparently employed the old Roman towns as military strongholds.[3]

culture &c. in S. Wales (Davies, W.), ii. 320, and Hunt, *op. cit.* p. 20). The same may be said of the Montgomeryshire mines, save that a pick, undoubtedly Roman, has been discovered in the mines near Machynlleth (Hunt, *op. cit.* p. 40). Scoriæ of ancient smelting hearths have also been found at Llanfyllin (*Powysland Club Collections*, iii. 59), Llanwyddyn (*ib.* vii. 68), and at Newtown Park, near the traditional mining-town of Caersws (Hunt, *op. cit.* pp. 28–9). The 'Ogofau' gold mines, with their wide Roman levels, near Llanpumpsaint, co. Carmarthen, are unique of their kind (*Arch. Journal*, vii. 173; Hunt, *op. cit.* p. 43). It is a matter of doubt whether the Romans knew of the golden treasure embedded in the Merionethshire hills, and the minerals of Pembrokeshire were apparently untouched. Evidences in many places of the use of coal in Roman times have been found in the Forest of Dean (*Archæologia* (1900), p. 316).

The above references throw little light upon the extent of Roman mining in Wales. With the departure of the Romans the industry would be limited rather than suspended. The mines would no longer be worked for the purposes of a transmarine trade on imperial profit, but would be worked, as far as the disturbed state of the country allowed, to meet local requirements. Comparatively little has been written on mining in Wales from the departure of the Romans until the arrival of the German miners in the sixteenth century. See below, p. 142.

[1] *Hist. of Monmouth* (Williams, D.), p. 62.

[2] Gomme (G. L.), *Village Community*, pp. 60–1.

[3] See Nennius (E.H.S. ed. Stevenson), p. 62, and Kemble, *Saxons in England*, ii. 169. The disappearance of Roman towns in Wales is attributed by Wright to the devastating policy of the Welsh (comparing the case of the Saxon in England): *The Celt, the Roman, and the Saxon*, pp. 453–4. More in harmony with the testimony of Giraldus of the abundant Roman remains at Caerleon (*Itin. Camb.* (Rolls Series), p. 58) and Carmarthen (*ib.* p. 80) is the view of Kemble (*op. cit. ut supra*, p. 291), who attributes the decay of Roman towns to (1) time, (2) natural causes, (3) neglect. It should be remembered

Economic development was hardly possible during the brief intervals of peace that occurred from the seventh to the tenth century. During this period Wales was continually disturbed by the gradual advance of the English on the East and the occasional incursions of the Danes to the West, as well as by the internecine warfare between rival Welsh chieftains for supremacy amongst themselves.

After the formation of Offa's Dyke, we find no marked advance in the English conquest until the eve of the Norman conquest, when the frontier towns of Rhuddlan and Radnor originated the colonisation of Wales by English and Norman settlers. Hitherto the English policy had been mainly one of defence, and consequently caused no drastic changes in the economic condition of the Welsh.

With better relations existing between the Welsh Church and the See of Canterbury on the Easter controversy, and the frequent rendering of tribute by the Welsh princes to English sovereigns, the little commercial transactions that took place between English and Welsh were facilitated. We have faint indications of a trade with Chester[1] and Bristol. Salt was probably imported to Wales from the Cheshire district at an early date.[2] Bristol exchanged its corn for Welsh butter and cheese. Tradition has it that the Welsh slave trade came to an abrupt ending in the seventh century, when St. Patrick excommunicated a Cardigan prince for selling slaves to the pagan Saxons.[3] But we have evidence of this later.[4]

One of the early relations between Wales and Ireland is to be seen in the reciprocal intercourse of Welsh and Irish

that the Welsh were unable to repair with stone material (Clark's (G. T.) *Medieval Architecture*, i. 12–13), and the art of brickmaking was long since lost (G. L. Gomme, *op. cit. supra*, p. 47).

[1] The men of Edeyrnion buy their necessaries at Chester (*Myvyrian Archaiology* (Denbigh edition), p. 728; *The Welsh People* (Prof. Rhys and Brynmôr Jones), p. 168).

[2] Lysons's *Mag. Brit.* ii. pt. 2, 409–10.

[3] Cf. *ib.* p. 606, and *Social England*, p. 87.

[4] See *Wales Past and Present* (C. Wilkins), pp. 240–1.

ecclesiasts for purposes of religious instruction.[1] Some of our ports bear a pious nomenclature,[2] but historic attention is first drawn to them by the Danish and Norse incursions of the ninth and following centuries. The character generally given to the Dane or Northman—the Pagan or Black Gentile of the Welsh Bruts and *Annales*—is that of a destroyer. It is, however, probable, as some exceptional entries in the Bruts suggest,[3] that some kind of Norse colonies were founded. 'The Northmen seemed to have known Wales well . . . and called it "Bretland."[4] This is to some extent evident from the nomenclature of some of the maritime towns and districts of South and North-west Wales, as well as from the Scandinavian descent of several South-Welsh townsmen during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The presence of the latter, moreover, is often attributed to the settlement of Norwegian merchants in towns of Norman or English foundation, as at Cardiff, Cardigan, and Carmarthen. The ports of Swansea and Haverfordwest, from the nomenclature of places and persons, are said to be of Norse origin.[5] Whatever colonies there may have been, they were apparently small. We have no trace of their influence upon the mysterious coinage of Wales, as is found to be the case in Ireland. The Danish populace of the South Welsh coast undoubtedly favoured commercial intercourse with Ireland and other transmarine countries and thus laid the foundation of Welsh seafaring trade. The Welsh were indifferent seamen; when they required ships they always turned to Ireland.[6]

[1] *Eccles. Hist. of Ireland* (Killen, W. D.), i. 26, 159; *History of the Welsh Church* (Newell, E. J.), p. 173.

[2] *E.g.* see *Iolo MSS.* (pub. 1848 by the Welsh MSS. Soc.), p. 636.

[3] See *Brut y Tywysogion* (Rolls Series), *s.a.* 991 and 1087, where the 'Pagans' are employed as mercenaries by the Welsh.

[4] *An Account of the Danes in England, &c.* (Worsaae, J. J. A.), p. 7.

[5] *Norse Settlements round the Bristol Channel* (by Dr. Alexander Bugge), pp. 1–11; *Videnskabsselskabets Skrifter II. Historisk-filosofisk Klasse*, 1900, no. 6. *Cf.* Worsaae, *op. cit.* pp. 8, 23; *Land of Morgan* (G. T. Clark), p. 16; *Concise Hist. of Glamorgan* (J. R. Phillips), p. 26; *Arch. Camb.* 4th series, ii. 247–8; *Engl. Hist. Review* (note by Mr. W. H. Stevenson), xvi. 551.

[6] *Transactions of the Cymmrodorion Soc.*, Session 1899–1900, *The Coming of the Normans* (by Prof. J. E. Lloyd), p. 137.

Welsh princes were too much absorbed with their internal disputes to trouble themselves with the development of a maritime trade, whilst the home-made coracle best served the purposes of inland navigation.

A noble attempt was made to ameliorate the national condition by Howel the Good. The Codes associated with his name cast an interesting sidelight on the domestic and economic condition of the Welsh at this time.

They evidently depict the condition of a people who are often engaged in war. Several members of the royal household have their annual stipend from the booty obtained from a border country.[1]

Agriculture was not extensively practised. Disputes often arose between co-tillers as to the ploughing of 'bushy land.'[2] The economy of the pasture and the forest predominated. Sheep-farming and cattle-rearing were the chief agricultural pursuits. Bees were commonly kept, for their wax to make candles and for their honey to sweeten the metheglin, the characteristic British drink.

The forest supplied timber for the construction of their buildings. It also furnished fuel for the homestead and the furnace.

The chief artisans were the smith and the carpenter, who made the weapons of war and the implements of husbandry.

Articles of clothing and other domestic effects were manufactured from the wool of the sheep and the skin of the ox. Flax (in addition to cabbages and leeks)[3] was grown in a garden near the homestead, and was used in the manufacture of a rough kind of cloth.[4]

These industries were mostly of a domestic character. The chief groom made his own halters,[5] as did the huntsman his own leashes.[6] We find no specialised skill, excepting perhaps the smith and the carpenter. The ploughman

[1] *Ancient Laws and Institutes of Wales* (Rec. Com.), p. 16.
[2] *Ib.* p. 155. [3] *Ib.* p. 158. *Cf.* pp. 163, 275.
[4] *Ib.* p. 127 ('weaving women'). *Cf.* p. 155 below. [5] *Ib.* p. 14.
[6] *Ancient Laws and Institutes of Wales* (Rec. Com.), p. 17.

knew how to construct his plough and repair the broken trappings.

We have no indications of an urban economy. The Welsh were primarily a pastoral people—a nation of dairy-farmers grouped together in self-sufficing hamlets. Salt is the chief foreign product noted in the Codes.

Trading with the tribesman was not a question of where, but of what and how much. That is to say, it was no matter where the bargain was made so long as the quality and price of the chattel bought and sold gave equal satisfaction. Thus the Codes set forth the 'teithi' or essential features of a sound animal and its legal worth.[1] Commercial activity, therefore, was not confined as elsewhere to a town, but was diffused throughout the land.

The nearest approach in the old Cymric economy to the modern idea of a town will perhaps be found in the *tref* or village surrounding the palace of a Welsh prince,[2] or that which flourished near a local church or Celtic monastery.[3] To such peaceful centres traffic must have been led for purposes of luxury or religion.

The point to be noticed is this: We cannot find the trace of anything like a market jurisdiction. The two references to markets made in the collection of Old Welsh laws supplementary to the Codes are probably the results of Norman or English influence. We should hardly expect to be told by the Welsh economist of the tenth century that there ought not to be any privileged markets but in *the legitimate corporate cities*.[4] However, the second reference is more tolerable. It reads thus: 'Whoever from the country (or *wlat*) shall buy in a market, let him be of the same privilege as a market man. If a market man buy in the country, let him be of the

[1] E.g., *ib.* p. 135: 'The teithi of a sheep: to give milk and to bear lambs; to be warranted against the rot until the calends of May, when she shall have satiated herself three times with the new herbage.'

[2] Cf. *The Welsh People*, p. 248.

[3] *E.g.* Llanbadarn, Llandaff, &c.

[4] *Ancient Laws and Institutes of Wales* (Rec. Com.), p. 651.

same privilege with a country man as to his barter.'[1] Without pretending to define the exact significance and bearing of this entry, we have here a compromise between the trade of the tribe and that of the townsman. The trade of the *patria*, with the growing importance of the middleman, is gradually drawn to the *forum*.

Trading activity, with its fixed centres and market privileges, was not known to the Wales of the tenth century. Giraldus Cambrensis confirms this view two centuries later. 'The Welsh,' he says, 'have no towns, villages, or castles. They pay no attention to commerce, shipping, or manufactures. They anxiously study the defence of their country.'[2] It would appear from this that no great changes occurred in the Cymric economy from the tenth to the twelfth century.

It is in the Norman aspect of the English conquest that we perceive drastic changes taking place.

In passing from the economy of the Welsh to that of the Norman, with due respect to the artistic ability of the early Welsh sculptor, it is very true to say that we are passing from the economy of timber to the economy of stone.

The building of castles, the erection of monasteries, and the walling of towns—all this, done by the Norman, marks a new stage in the development of the mineral resources of Wales.[3] The early history of our stone, lime, and slate quarries, as well as of our coal and lead mines, may be gleaned from the extant accounts we possess of building operations, be they of the mill, town, church, or castle. Few of these accounts exist prior to the reign of Edward I.[4]

The Welsh soon learnt the art of masonry. The native

[1] *Ancient Laws and Institutes of Wales* (Rec. Com.), p. 416.

[2] *Descr. Kamb.* (Rolls Series), pp. 179–180. [3] See below, p. 142.

[4] The *Expensa* (Q. R. Accts., Miscellanea, Works), the *Liberate* and Pipe Rolls, together with the *Ministers' Accounts* (General Series) from this point onwards, exhibit in a precise way the industrial economy of the time, the rate of wages, the prices of materials, the cost and means of transit, &c. For example, see *Archæologia*, xxviii. 221; copy and translation of a Roll of Expenses of King Edward I. at Rhuddlan, 1281–2, and *Arch. Journal*, vii. 237 *et seq.*; *Carnarvon Castle* (by C. H. Hartshorne); also pp. 142–7 below.

chroniclers, with an air of surprise, announce in 1171 that the Lord Rhys of Dinevaior rebuilt the castle of Cardigan with stone and mortar.[1] Castle Maud or Pain's Castle in the Elvael district, formerly built of wood, was reconstructed *de lapide et cemento* in 1231.[2]

Equally true is it to say that in passing from the economy of the Welsh to that of the Norman, we are passing from the economy of no-towns to the economy of towns. There are no towns of purely Cymric origin. The growth of towns in Wales may be assigned to English or Norman influence.

The expansion of commercial privileges in Wales is co-extensive with the progress of the English conquest. In the Marches it is the work of the Norman lord; in the Principality, the accomplishment of the English king.

From 1081 to 1282 the Marcher lordships, with their respective groups of towns, were formed. Those on the English border, and along the lowland sill of Glamorgan towards the Pembrokeshire coast, came first into prominence. One peculiar feature of these burghal settlements was the modelling of their privileges upon the Hereford type.[3] During this period they were little more than garrison towns inhabited and visited by Norse,[4] Fleming, French, and English merchants with an occasional Jew.[5] They were thus foreign or nominally English towns in a Welsh land,[6] and often became

[1] *Brut y Tywysogion* (Rolls Series), *s.a. cit.*

[2] Matt. Paris, *Hist. Angl.* (Rolls Series), ii. 332.

[3] Gross, *Gild Merchant*, p. 261. See 'The Laws of Breteuil' (by Miss Mary Bateson), *Engl. Hist. Review*, vols. xv. & xvi., invaluable to students of the Welsh boroughs.

[4] *Cf.* p. 125, note 5, above.

[5] There were not many Jews in Wales beyond those radiating from the Jewries of Hereford and Bristol in the Marcher towns. The typical charter of the North Welsh boroughs includes the clause prohibiting the residence of Jews within their liberties. Jewish merchants and artisans hailing from South Wales are to be found among the free citizens of Dublin early in the thirteenth century. We find Solomon of Cardiff, Abram the son of Bernard of Cardigan, Adam of Newport, and Adam of South Wales (*Hist. and Municip. Documents, Ireland*, 1172–1230 (ed. Gilbert), p. 2 *et seq.*, and p. 136).

[6] See note 1 on next page. *Cf.* Freeman's *English Towns and Districts*, p. 16.

the objects of devastation by the Welsh.[1] There was not the requisite security to ensure unchecked progress in municipal and commercial life ; bailiffs are careful to note that their returns were proportionate to the stability of peace in the neighbourhood.[2] The towns enjoyed a practical monopoly of trade within their respective lordships.[3] Their merchants were engaged in such shipping as concerned the garnishment of the castle,[4] and an inconsiderable trade was being carried on with Ireland.[5]

Loyal Welshmen of the inland or strictly Welsh districts were permitted to trade in these Marcher towns, particularly the religious, whose fidelity aroused less suspicion.[6] The burgesses of Shrewsbury were accustomed to receive toll from Welshmen, bringing their merchandise to the town over the Welsh bridge, before 1205 ;[7] and later in the century Welshmen find a place among the foreign members of the town guild.[8] The trade people of the Mid-Welsh district generally brought their merchandise to Hereford, Leominster,[9] and Shrewsbury, and occasionally attended some of

[1] *Annales Cambriæ* (Rolls Series), pp. 36, 58, 59, 63, 71, 74, 78, 92, 93, 98; and *Brut y Tywysogion* (Rolls Series), pp. 250–1, 318, 320.

[2] I. P. M. 4 Ed. I. No. 84 (*s.n.* Kidwelly) ; *History of Neath Abbey* (W. de Gray Birch, F.S.A.), p. 235.

[3] *Cardiff Records* (ed. John Hobson Matthews), i. 26, and Dillwyn's (L. W.) *Contributions to the History of Swansea*, p. 5.

[4] *Præstita* Roll 1211 (Rec. Com.), p. 245 (four ships bring corn to Wales), and Pipe Roll, 3 H. II. (Pipe Roll Soc.), p. 108, for a ship hired to take provisions from Winchester to Pembroke.

[5] *Calendar of Documents, Ireland* (1171–1251), Nos. 2108 and 2733 ; also Pipe Roll, 18 H. II. (Pipe Roll Soc.), p. 119.

[6] *E.g.* Patent Roll, 26 H. III. m. 8. The bishop of St. Asaph to be free from all toll in the towns of Salop, to buy whatsoever for his own use and that of his family. A like concession to David the son of Llewelyn 'as long as he faithfully serves us.' On the same membrane the king expresses his wish that 'our land of England and our land of Wales' should be common to English and Welsh merchants for purposes of trade. Notification to this effect is sent to J. Extraneus, the Justiciar of Chester, and J. de Monmouth, the constable of Carmarthen and Cardigan. *Cf.* note 8 on next page.

[7] Owen and Blakeway's *Hist. of Shrewsbury*, i. 87.

[8] *Ib.* p. 103.

[9] *Royal and Hist. Letters* (ed. Shirley), ii. 156–7. The merchants of Builth, Elvael, Warthrinnion, and Cardigan, attending the fairs of Leominster, complain of the tyranny of Mortimer's servants ; cf. *Ancient Correspondence* (P.R.O.),

the large English fairs.[1] Merlins[2] (mountain ponies), sheep,[3] wool,[4] arrows,[5] spears,[6] and pastoral produce were usually exchanged for corn, salt, wine, and other articles of small merchandise.[7]

The enjoyment of commercial privileges by the men of a Welsh district was conditional on the loyalty of their prince.[8] An act of disloyalty on the part of a prince resulted in the disfranchisement of his men.[9] We find a reluctance on the part of English sovereigns to permit the enjoyment of market and fair privileges in districts subject to a Welsh prince.[10] It was part of their policy of conquest

vol. xxiii. No. 1891, where Llewelyn ap Grufudd complains of the harm done to his people whilst attending the fairs at Montgomery und Leominster.

[1] Letters of safe-conduct to the men of Carmarthen (1220) in going, staying, and returning to the fair of St. Egidius at Winchester (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1216-25, p. 252; *Munimenta Gildhallæ Londoniensis* (Rolls Series), ii. 2, 655). Welshmen among others permitted (5 Ric. I.) to go to Boston, Lincoln, and Winchester fairs. Cf. *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1317–21), p. 21. Tin and steel bought in the markets of Boston and elsewhere for the works and munition of the king's castles in North Wales.

[2] The Pipe Roll of the Bishopric of Winchester, 1208–1209, Introd. xviii. Cf. *ib.* p. 23.

[3] Welsh mountain sheep were sometimes bought in the Marcher districts of the low-lying English pastures (*Roll of the Household Expenses of Bp. Swinfield* (Camden Soc.), i. 188–9).

[4] The merchants of St. Omer (*de Sancto Homero*) dealt in Welsh wool as early as 1205 (*Cal. Rot. Lit. Claus.* (Rec. Com.), p. 55), and the men of Carmarthen brought their wools to Bristol before 1218 (*ib.* p. 353).

[5] For Welsh arrows see *Publications of the Selden Soc.* xiii. 80, 96, 101, 152.

[6] Spears (*hastæ*) were brought from Wales to Taunton (co. Somerset) as early as 1209 (note 2 above).

[7] *Descr. Kamb.* (Rolls Series), pp. 218–9. 'Interim autem cuncta mercimonia ferri, panni, salis, et bladi, quibus ab Anglicana copia sustentare solent, arctius eis inhibeantur.' *Cf.* Pipe Roll, 13 H. II. (Pipe Roll. Soc.), p. 77; *ib.* 16 H. II. p. 154 (*re* corn), and *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1225–1232), p. 203; also Pipe Roll, 18 H. II. p. 119 (*re* salt).

[8] Close Roll, 16 H. III. Grant (dated August 8) to the men of Llewelyn, Prince of Aberfraw, Lord of Snowdon, to trade freely in all the markets and fairs held in the bailiwicks of Salop, Stafford, Hereford, and Worcester, until Michaelmas next following and as long as the friendly relations which now exist between the Lord King and Llewelyn should last.

[9] *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1216–25), p. 386, *re* men of Maelgwyn, son of Rhys, &c., in South Wales.

[10] *Cal. Close Rolls* (1272–79), p. 51. Inhibition of Llewelyn ap Grufudd erecting a castle and market at Abermule, near Montgomery.

to keep them dependent upon the border towns, so that in case of revolt supplies could be more readily cut off. This was the usual procedure when war broke out, the markets of the Marcher towns being temporarily suspended,[1] and all commercial transactions with the Welsh being rigidly prohibited.[2] This starvation policy was preached by Giraldus in the twelfth century,[3] and was to some extent carried out by Henry III. and Edward I. in their final conquest of Wales.[4]

The English conquest of Wales had both a political and an economic effect. The political aspect of the conquest comes to a close with the fall of Llewelyn ap Grufudd in 1282. The Principality was annexed to the English Crown. This changed condition in the relation of the Crown to the Principality marks the commencement of a new period in the history of Wales. Before the conquest the English sovereign and the Marcher lord were united in their attempts to overthrow the Welsh prince, after the conquest it is the contest of the English sovereign and Norman lord. The extinction of the old royal line of Welsh princes at the close of the thirteenth century, and the absorption of the Marcher lordships during the first half of the sixteenth century, made Wales a parcel of the English realm.

The medium in both instances was the shire system. Edward consolidated his hold on the Principality by founding the castle, the town, and the shire. The Norman lord, in the earlier period, consolidated his hold by founding the castle, the town, and the lordship. Both systems centralised the trading activity of the tribal Celt. But, compared with that of the Norman lord, Edward's policy was broad. We change the isolation of the lordship for the aspirations of the kingdom. The centralisation of the Marcher lord was local

[1] Frontier towns like Shrewsbury (*Royal and Hist. Letters* (Rolls), ii. 310–11), and Hereford (Pipe Roll, 14 H. II. p. 117; 15 H. II. p. 28; 18 H. II. p. 3) suffered from depression of trade during a Welsh war. For temporary suspension of markets see *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1225–32), pp. 81–2, 584.

[2] *Cal. Close Rolls* (1227–31), pp. 537, 588; also *Cal. of Documents, Ireland, a.* 1231, no. 1930; *s.a.* 1233, no. 2073.

[3] See note 7 on the preceding page. [4] *Cal. Close Rolls* (1272–79), p. 410.

and irregular, that of the English Crown was general and uniform.

Sufficient evidence has survived to give us a fairly detailed sketch of Edward I.'s policy in the Principality. We have no such early records for the Marcher lordships. A consideration of these affords a glimpse of the means by which the tribal Welsh were accustomed to a more fixed and at the same time more civilised mode of living.

Both castle and town were connected with the neighbouring districts. The *castellaria* or castle district corresponded to the market district. Bondmen of the castle district were responsible for a part of the castle foods,[1] and all inhabitants of the market district had to bring their merchandise to the town.[2] The constable of the castle was mayor of the town.

The Edwardian towns in the Principality were thus made dependent on the surrounding districts. The growth of these towns will explain the development of a reciprocal dependence on the part of the country. Additional interest is added to the story, from the fact that these towns, like the towns of the Marches, were English towns in a Welsh country. Racial antipathy colours the growth of the municipal element in Wales. As with the frontier towns on the English border of the Welsh March,[3] it is by no means an unusual circumstance for towns placed in the heart of Wales to receive grants of murage, to support the reparation of the town walls against what the burgesses sometimes express as 'the menacing attitude' of the surrounding Welsh.[4]

[1] *Transactions of the Cymmrodorion Society*, Session 1902–3.

[2] *Rec. of Carn.* p. 132. 'Item ordinatum fuit per conquestorem [*i.e.* Edw. I.] quod nulli Wallenses facerent aliquas mercandizas extra villas mercatorias nec brasearent ad vendendum sub forisfactura mercandizarum et imprisonamenti ac redempcionis faciendi.' *Ib.* p. 223 (Beaumaris market district). *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1476–85), p. 504 (Denbigh).

[3] *E.g.* Shrewsbury, in consideration of its nearness to Wales, and of its consequent need to be very well fortified, received a grant of murage in 1423 (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1422-29, p. 140).

[4] *Ancient Petitions* (P.R.O.), No. 2683. The men of Carmarthen pray for a grant of murage to repair the town walls, 'pur les Galeies que lour manacent de jour en autre de prendre la dite ville.'

It was, no doubt, with a certain amount of misgiving that the simple Welshman ventured with his scanty produce to the English markets. He went, at first, armed, as if for battle.[1] Fairs, or at least markets, were indeed new to the Welshman.[2] He was ignorant of the regulations, and often, to his own cost, commenced business before the statutory hour.[3] With rank patriotism he suspected the new-fangled measures in use,[4] and the new coinage, although hailed as the fulfilment of Merlin's prophecy,[5] was often the cause of heated controversies.[6]

[1] Cf. *Rec. of Carn.* p. 131. 'Item Wallenses non portabunt aliqua arma invasiva nec defensiva ad villas mercatorias, nundinas, ecclesias, seu congregaciones, sub pena amissionis huiusmodi armaturæ et imprisonamenti per unum annum.'

[2] *Ib.* p. 213. 'Ad communem peticionem factam quod non distringantur ad solvendum tolnetum nisi eodem modo quo fieri consueverunt temporibus regis et principis, videlicet in nundinis tamen. Præceptum est quod tolnetum capiatur nundinis et mercatis secundum quod hactenus est alibi a burgis villis mercatoriis.'

[3] *Court Rolls* (P.R.O.), Portf. 215, No. 53, m. 2 (dorse).

[4] *Rec. of Carn.* p. 213.

[5] *Brut y Tywysogion* (Rolls Series), *s.a.* 1279. *Annals of the Coinage* (Ruding, R.), i. 195.

[6] Powell's (D.) *Hist. of Wales* (1812 edition), App. p. 358. One Cadvan Ddu was fined 6*s.* 4*d.* because he refused to take the old money for the new (*sic*). No coins which can be supposed to have been issued by Welsh princes are at this time known to exist. A vague account has been given of some triangular silver coins with a hole in the centre and a circular inscription found in Cardiganshire and Carmarthen, and conjectured to have been the money of some Welsh prince (*Annals of the Coinage* (Ruding, R.), i. 195). The right of coining, we know, was included among the prerogative powers of the Welsh prince (*Ancient Laws and Institutes of Wales* (Rec. Com.), p. 573), and fines imposed in the laws are sometimes rated in money alone (*ib.* p. 141), and sometimes in cattle and money jointly (*ib.* p. 252). King Athelstan imposed on the Welsh an annual tribute in money and kind (*Register of Malmesbury*, Rolls Series, i. 53; cf. *Notes and Queries* (Series I.), ii. 231, 346; *The Cambrian and Caledonian Quarterly Magazine*, v. (1883) 251–255). It has been suggested that the Welsh made use of Saxon and Norman pennies during the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries (*Arch. Camb.* 3rd series, v. 151–2). Mints were established at Chester, Hereford, and Shrewsbury in Athelstan's reign, and at Ludlow and Bristol soon after (Ruding, *op. cit. sup.* ii. 157, 175, 176, 209, 212). Rhuddlan mint is referred to in Domesday (*ib.* p. 240) and coins were struck at Cardiff by Stephen, Henry II., and Henry III. The privilege of a 'mint (bathoriaiyth) at Llandaff' is included among the old privileges of Teilo (*Book of Llandav* (ed. Rhys and Evans), p. 120). Flemish coins (brass pieces) have been found near Caerphilly Castle, which bear the trace of the Flemish artisan (*Archæologia*, ii. 12). In the Pipe Roll of 31 H. I. (Rec. Com.) p. 136, a moneyer (*monetarius*) appears in Pembroke.

The Welshman found that the market and fair narrowed that tribal latitude to which he had been accustomed. Hitherto he had made his bargains in the country (*in patria*): now he had to present his flock in the neighbouring market,[1] and expose himself to the dangers that then accompanied the going and the coming, even though the king had ordered the woods to be cut down to facilitate this traffic.[2] Again, he could not any longer brew at home for commercial profit, if within a prescribed area of a borough,[3] and even when beyond the radius he was subject to the Assize of Beer.

The Welshman of the Principality in the fourteenth century found himself surrounded with a body of rules the fixedness of which he had not dreamt of before, though his neighbours in the Marches had already felt these restraining influences as tenants of a Norman lordship.

This process of centralising the commercial transactions of the tribal community, or the growth of commercial privileges, must form the chief feature in the story of Trade and Industry in Wales during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The records available allow of no other general treatment.

[1] *Rec. of Carn.* p. 212. 'Ad communem peticionem factam quod singuli possint emere et vendere victualia, equos, boves, et vaccas pro sustentatione sua *quilibet vicinus de alio in patria extra mercata et nundinas.* Ita quod pro huius empcionibus vel vendicionibus non occasionentur seu amercientur et similiter.' Concurrent with this there was a general outcry against the obvious inconvenience occasioned by the ordinance that one from each house should attend the market once a week, whether he had business or not, the express object being to add to the number of people in the market (*ad multiplicandum populum in foro*). The reply to both these petitions was in the form of a compromise; those having no business to transact were not forced to attend, and in the case of travellers and those far removed from markets, necessaries of life, as milk, butter, and cheese, could be sold *in patria.*

[2] See below, p. 139.

[3] See *Royal Charters and Hist. Documents of Carmarthen* (1878), by J. R. Daniel-Tyssen, p. 24; *Rec. of Carn.* p. 139; and *Min. Acc.* 1219–13 (date 1322), where John ap Saer and four others are fined because they brewed beer and mead within five miles (*leucæ*) of the town of Carmarthen. In North Wales brewing for purposes of sale was forbidden in districts within eight miles (*leucæ*) of a borough (Additional MS. 33372, f. 8). *Cf.* Dugdale's *Monasticon*, vi. pt. 2 p. 1898.

The extant evidence for the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries throws more light upon the character of Welsh trade and industry. We are enabled to supplement the general evidence of the charter by the minuter details of the account.

For the sake of clearness we treat of Industry and Commerce in Wales during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries under two sections :—(1) Internal ; (2) External.

The internal section is subdivided into five minor sections —the first two dealing with the activity of the country under the general headings of (1) Agriculture and (2) The Forest ; the next two deal with the activity of the country and of the town, *i.e.* with (3) The Fisheries, and (4) The Wool Trade and the Cloth Industry. The last (5) section deals with the town as a factor in the Internal Trade. The External Trade is wholly concerned with the activity of the Welsh ports.

Tabulated they appear thus :

Industry and Commerce in Wales during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries	Internal I	1. Agriculture		Activity of the Country
		2. The Forest		
		3. The Fisheries		Activity of the Country and of the Town
		4. The Wool Trade and the Cloth Industry		
		5. The Towns		Activity of the Towns
	External II	Exports / Imports	The Ports	

I. Internal Trade

1. *Agriculture*

The general improvement which is perceptible in the state of Welsh agriculture after the Norman conquest may doubtless be attributed to the clearing of forest lands as well as to the influence of the feudal system as a factor in economic development.[1]

The clearing of the forest was essential to the successful advance of English arms,[2] and was, too, the result of the pious

[1] See Owen's *Pembrokeshire* (Cymmrodorion, Record Series, No. I., ed. Dr. Henry Owen), p. 61, for a suggested influence of the laws of primogeniture and gavelkind upon agricultural economy.

[2] P. 139 below.

exercise of the energetic monks.[1] This good work was still going on. The monks of Basingwerk received a grant of the wood of Getly in Flintshire, in 1278, on condition that within three years they cause the wood to be rooted up.[2] The national abbey of Ystrad Flur was rebuilt in 1300 upon the understanding that all woods and ways around it should be cut down,[3] and the moors of Monmouthshire, to the south-east, still bear indelible traces of the monk as the pioneer of agriculture.[4]

But in spite of the new impetus given to agriculture by the clearing of forest lands, and the gradual disappearance of the tribal economy, Wales was not a great corn-producing country during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

'Wales,' according to William of Newborough (Newburgh) in the twelfth century, 'possesses excellent pastures for the feeding of cattle, but few fields, and those bearing little wheat; it does not provide its own people with sufficient nourishment without the importation of supplies from the neighbouring English provinces.'[5] This is equally true of Wales in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Owing to the influx of English inhabitants, there was an increased demand for corn, the normal production of which was checked at this time by special causes.

The petty revolts of the fourteenth century, and the national rising of Owen Glyndwr in the fifteenth, had marked effects in this direction. Grinding mills were levelled to the ground, and the inhabitants, from sheer terror, refrained from sowing their seed.[6] Some of the more timid left their lands,

[1] See *History of Margam Abbey* (Birch), pp. 14, 46, 60, 180, *230.

[2] *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1272–81), p 256. [3] *Ib.* (1292–1301), p. 499.

[4] Williams's *Hist. of Monmouthshire*, p. 357. For the influence of the monk on the moor- and marsh-lands of Glamorgan, see note 1 above.

[5] *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I.* (Rolls Series), i. 107.

[6] See *Min. Acc.* 1170–4–5 as to the revolt of Madoc ap Llewelyn in the North, 1294; for the similar influence of the rising of Llewelyn Bren in the South (1316) see *Min. Acc.* 1202–6–9. Copious extracts of the latter accounts are given in the *Cardiff Records*, i. 107–49. The widespread influence of the national rebellion under Glyndwr may be gathered in great part from the *Ministers Accounts* (P.R.O. General Series) relating to Wales from 1400 to 1420.

and it was common for the bond-tenants of the royal manors to flee to the marshes.[1]

With the Black Death began, we know, the tendency for the conversion of arable land into pasture.[2] Apart from this there was a general scarcity of corn in Wales during the period.

On the Close Roll of 1331, we find permission given to two merchants, named David le Palmer and Hugh le Mareys, to take 500 quarters of corn to Wales from the neighbourhood of Bridgwater, notwithstanding the previous proclamation to the contrary, the king, we are told, compassionating the estate of the Welsh people, where there is a great scarcity of corn.[3] In one of the earliest manorial accounts we possess for Wales, giving particulars of the grange in the manors of the lordship of Glamorgan in 1263, the majority of the seed (including wheat, rye, and oats) for sowing purposes was acquired by purchase. The document is particularly interesting and valuable in so far as it illustrates the quantity sown per Welsh acre, and the amount paid per quarter.[4] The native diet of meat and milk found no favour with the foreign element of the Welsh populace.[5] The burgesses of Haverford brought a thousand quarters of English corn into Wales in 1331,[6] as did the merchants of Dublin, less 200 quarters, about forty years later.[7] The English garrisons that were placed in the North Welsh castles made their bread from corn purchased at Chester and elsewhere.[8]

The chief wealth of the country during this epoch lay in

[1] *Acts of the Privy Council*, 1417, p. 231. Petition from the bond-tenants of Merioneth, Carnarvon, and Anglesey who fled to the Marches in the time of war, that they may return and inhabit the seignory where they were born. Cf. *Min. Acc.* 1305–8.

[2] *Transactions of the Cymmrodorion Society*, 1902–3.

[3] *Cal. Close Rolls* (1330–33), p. 284.

[4] *Min. Acc.* Bundle 1202–1. *Compotus* Roll of the 'Lands of Richard de Clare in Glamorgan' in the custody of Humphrey de Bohun.

[5] Cf. *Hist. Essays* (Owens College, 1902), p. 117.

[6] *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1330–34), p. 80.

[7] *Ib.* (1377–1381), p. 237.

[8] E.g. *Min. Acc.* 1305–17, and other Chamberlain accounts of North Wales.

its extensive pastures, its herds of cattle, and in its large flocks of sheep. It is in mountainous Radnor, with its pinfolds for the marking of cattle and the catching of sheep, rather than in fertile Anglesea, with its mills for grinding corn, that we recognise the prevailing tendencies of Welsh industry and commerce during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

This fact explains the items contained in the market and murage accounts of the local towns—the organs of internal trade. It also colours the custom accounts of the ports—the dépôts of external trade, where wool, woolfells, cloth, and hides are generally to be found. It will further illustrate the bent of the native industries. Welsh industry, at this time, finds its chief scope in the fulling-mill rather than in the coal-pit. Sheep-farming, dairy-keeping, and cloth-weaving were the staple branches of industry in medieval Wales.

2. *The Forest*

An item of considerable importance in the industry and commerce of medieval Wales is the many-sided activity connected with its forests.

The cutting down of woods in Wales forms one of the permanent features of English policy during the Middle Ages. What Henry II. did in the woods of Ceiriog for military purposes in 1164,[1] Henry III. does for commercial objects in the Forest of Towy in 1223.[2] Edward I. in 1278 orders the woods in the Montgomery district to be cut for the common weal of his subjects.[3] This policy improved the conditions both of trade and agriculture.

Fuel and divers materials for building operations were supplied from the forests, each district drawing its requirements from the local forest.

The de Braoses, in their early charters to the burgesses of Swansea, allowed them free access to the forests of Gowerland,

[1] *Brut y Tywysogion* (Rolls Series), p. 201.
[2] *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1216–25), p. 414.
[3] *Ib.* (1272–81), p. 270. Cf. *ib.* (1216–25), p. 424.

where they got deadwood and turf for purposes of fuel, and oak for building and repairing their houses, and the ships and boats that were at last a-building.[1] The Earls of Pembroke, too, preserved their principal forest of Coedtraeth for the supply of timber for the use of the castle as well as for the repairs of the mill.[2]

Wales was famous for its timber. We find that the monks of Abingdon received timber from the Welsh districts to repair their house early in the twelfth century. Wagons with twelve oxen attached to each performed the carriage, and the journey to and fro occupied seven weeks.[3]

Cilgerran forest in Pembroke,[4] and Dolvorwyn forest in Montgomery,[5] were noted for their oaks, and it was with Welsh oaks from the forest of Hay that the citizens of Hereford sometimes repaired their six gates and five bridges.[6]

Sufficient timber and stone for building and repairing purposes were supplied by the native forests, the labour being chiefly performed by Welshmen. Welsh carpenters were frequently engaged in the cutting and squaring of wood, in the construction of mill wheels, or the making of joists &c.[7] Welsh carriers were commonly employed to convey materials from the forest to the castle, or other place where building operations were being carried on. For example, one Madoc Cragh with his sixty-four companions, all with their pack-horses, conveyed timber and tiles (*cindulas*) from Beddgelert to the town of Carnarvon for the roofing of the royal granary there. Each horseman received threepence as wages.[8] Water

[1] L. Dillwyn's *Contrib. to the Hist. of Swansea*, pp. 4–5.

[2] Fenton's *Hist. Tour through Pembrokeshire*, p. 465.

[3] *Chronicon Monast. de Abingdon* (Rolls Series), ii. 122.

[4] See next page.

[5] *Cal. Close Rolls* (1272–79), p. 434.

[6] *Ib.* (1330–33), p. 223. For similar instances see *Roll of the Household Expenses of Bp. Swinfield* (Camden Soc.), i. 153; also Hereford MSS. (Rep. of Hist. MSS. Com.), p. 286.

[7] E.g. *Min. Acc.* 1227–7, 1223–8, 1224–6; Exchequer Q. R. Acc. 486–9, 487–1.

[8] Exchequer Q.R. Acc. (Bundle 486–9), *circa* 23–29 Ed. I.

carriage was utilised when feasible. Oaks were brought from Cilgerran [1] to Cardigan in the king's barges [2] on the river Teify, as were oaks from the forest of Snowdon despatched to various districts in North Wales from the little towns of Llanrwst and Trefriw by the passage of the Conway.[3] The small Egrin stream was employed to convey stone from a free quarry of that name to the castle works of Harlech,[4] as was the Towy, on a larger scale to Carmarthen, from a quarry near by called 'La Black.' [5]

There is no evidence to indicate an extensive export trade in timber. Native demand apparently regulated the trade. Scaffold poles were sometimes imported from Ireland,[6] as were planking boards in small quantities from the same place, as well as from England.[7] The port of Cardiff was early a dépôt for the sale of timber.[8]

Under the issues of the forest (*exitus forestæ*) [9] or the profits of the manor (*exitus manerii*) [10] we find sparse reference to medieval mining in Wales. Where operations had assumed an importance worthy of distinction, a separate item *exitus mineræ*,[11] finds place in the manorial account. Mining, however, in medieval Wales has none of the distinctiveness assigned to it by the skill of the Roman miner in ancient times, and by the speculation and individual enterprise of the

[1] Exchequer Q. R. Acc. 487–19; *Min. Acc.* 1223–6, 1306–7.

[2] Royal boats were commonly kept at Carmarthen, Carnarvon, and other castle towns to facilitate the victualling, &c. Like those in use on the important ferries, they were frequently farmed at an annual rent. Private boats engaged in the coasting trade between the Welsh ports were sometimes hired for this purpose.

[3] Exchequer Q. R. Acc. 485–30, 487–1, 3, 8.

[4] *Ib.* 485–26.

[5] *Ib.* 487–9.

[6] Jones and Freeman, *Hist. of St. Davids.* 'Liber Communis of St. Davids.' App. IV. p. 320. This 'book' throws goodly light upon the many wants of the Cathedral Church of St. Davids, and the manner in which they were supplied (pp. 369–89).

[7] *Min. Acc.* 1305–17. Three thousand boards bought at Chester and Lancashire, and conveyed to Beaumaris in a Liverpool ship, 1399.

[8] *Cardiff Records* (ed. Matthews), i. 106, 137 (tolls of timber sold there in 1314, *2s. 5d.*), 162.

[9] See p. 147, note 1, below.

[10] *History of Neath Abbey* (Birch), p. 237.

[11] *E.g.* p. 146, note 4, below.

modern age. It could never be far developed in a manorial or self-sufficing economy, the horizon of demand was too narrow to encourage production far beyond the adequate supply of local needs.

From the time of the Romans to the period of the Norman Conquest we have little authentic evidence of mining in Wales, save what may be inferred from the prominence of the smith in the Old Welsh Codes, and from the particular skill of the Welsh in the manufacture of weapons of war. Welsh arrows and spears, as we have already seen, formed part of their external trade in the thirteenth century.

The next authentic glimpse we have is the development of the mineral resources of the country upon manorial lines. Gilbert de Clare, we are told, found silver, lead, and iron mines in his land of Glamorgan in the year 1227,[1] and the monks of Margam about the same time were imprivileged by the local lords of Aberafon and Cornely to dig for coal, lead, and iron in their respective districts.[2] Later in the century, new life was given to mining operations in the Principality,[3] under royal patronage, in connection with the building of castles and the maintenance of town walls. The Crown, as a rule, jealously preserved its mining rights,[4] but during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries exhibits a growing tendency to farm its privileges at a money rent.[5] This cleared the way for the private adventure and the individual enterprise of the Elizabethan era, whence the modern (albeit the golden) period of Welsh mining takes its origin.

The workings during the Middle Ages were small, the development being hampered by both political and social circumstances. Colliers, charcoal-burners, lead-miners, and others engaged in mining operations often left the forest

[1] *Monastic Annals* (Rolls Series, ed. Luard), i. 70.

[2] *History of Margam Abbey* (Birch), pp. 197, 257, 274.

[3] See pp. 144–5 below.

[4] E.g. *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1476–85), p. 60. Reservation of mining rights in Warthrinnion, Cwmtauddwr, and other Marcher districts granted by Edward IV. to his eldest son, the Prince of Wales.

[5] See pp. 146–7 below.

through dread of a local or national revolt, and their numbers were often lessened in the venture.[1] Labourers, particularly skilled labourers,[2] were scarce at best.[3] The position was the more embarrassing from the fact of the immobility of labour. The prior and convent of Goldcliff in 1424 (seventy-five years after the undoings of the Black Death), anxious to repair the damage done to the walls of their convent by the sudden inundations of the sea, inform the king of their sorry plight, requesting the aid of stone-cutters and other labourers, 'since there are such customs in the said county of Wales that no labourers will leave the lordships wherein they dwell to do any work outside such lordships, so that there is a general dearth of labourers.'[4]

Incidental notices like the above throw interesting light upon the conditions of labour in Wales during the Middle Ages. Generally speaking, labour was scarce, immobile,[5] and subject to occasional interruption. The demand for mineral goods, as we have suggested above, was hardly a commercial one, though with the rise of towns and the development of a maritime trade it was gradually becoming more so. Here we have part explanation of the fact that the mineral resources

[1] *Min. Acc.* 1202–7. Account of Bartholomew de Badelesmere of the lands of G. de Clare, 1316. . . . 'Exitus forestæ [of Senghenydd]:—Idem respondet de iiij l. xviij s. de diversis carpentariis operantibus in bosco hoc anno. Et de xix s. receptis de diversis cariagiis mortui bosci hoc anno. Et non plus quia operatores in puteis carbonum recesserunt de foresta in guerra Hawysiæ. . . .

'. . . Exitus forestæ [of 'Maghay']. Et de xx l. xv s. iiij d. ob. de Dccc et xxx. duodenis et lx. summagiis carbonum factis et venditis in bosco hoc anno pro duodena vj d. Et sciendum quod minus respondetur de exitu eiusdem forestæ hoc anno quia plures homines qui solebant exercere dictam forestam destruebantur tempore guerræ.' See also *Rot. Parl.* i. 62.

[2] *Cal. Close Rolls* (1313–23), p. 127. Order to the keeper of the forest of Dene to deliver to Hugh le Despenser, the younger, lord of Glamorgan, in Wales, twelve of the king's iron-miners in his bailiwick fit for the work of iron-mines in Glamorgan at Hugh's expense. The like to the sheriffs of Somerset and Devon for twelve lead-miners each.

[3] Cf. p. 145, note 2, below.

[4] *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1422–29), p. 265.

[5] The application of the above-quoted instance of this to Wales in general is modified by the fact that the lords of the West and Marcher districts, as compared with those of other districts, are said to have kept a firmer grip upon their bondmen.

of Wales were not sufficiently developed during the Middle Ages to cope adequately with the native demand.

The local quarries, moreover, yielded sufficient stone and limestone.[1] North Wales was remarkable for its slate-stones; they were farmed in 1444 at 6*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* by Hugo Huls and Meredith ap Thomas,[2] and in 1509 at 7*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* by one Ieuan ap Tuder ap Dycus.[3] Anglesea, notably the commote of Twrcelyn,[4] was the chief dépôt for millstones in North Wales.[5] Millstones met with in the South Wales accounts come generally from the Forest of Dean, Tintern, and the Trillek quarries in Monmouthshire.[6] The districts of Wormsley, Kingsland, and Ludlow in the county of Hereford,[7] Norton near Presteign,[8] and Corndon forest in Montgomery[9] supplied the Mid-Wales and border districts. Hand-grindstones and millstones of Wales appear among the items of the murage custumals of Dublin about the middle of the fourteenth century,[10] which seems to show that they formed part of the exchange trade between Wales and Ireland.

Lead was produced on a small scale, mainly in Flintshire.

[1] Exchequer Q. R. Acc. (P.R.O.) *re* works of Welsh castles, *e.g.* Bundle 486–29—stone acquired for the building of Carnarvon Castle and the repairing of the town quay from six local quarries, three of which were situated in Anglesea; and Bundle 485–23—limestone brought from Talgarth to Builth. The castle of Drussellan in South Wales was built from stone found in a quarry near by (*ib.* 487–9). The Abbey of Llanthony was constructed from the freestone of the surrounding mountains (*Itin. Kamb.* (Rolls Series), p. 45).

[2] *Min. Acc.* 1226–5. [3] *Ib.* 23-24 H. VII., No. 1621.

[4] *Rot. Parl.* iv. 184a. The 'querrera molarium' in the commote in 1422 was worth 7*l.* yearly.

[5] A pair of millstones from the quarry of Mathavarn was conveyed in 1338 by sea to the port of Barmouth and thence by land to the mill of Llanegrin (*Min. Acc.* 1232–10). Anglesea millstones were brought to the mill of Carreghova, in Denbigh 1505 (*Min. Acc.* 20, H. VII., No. 1659).

[6] *Min. Acc.* 1202–7—millstones brought from St. Briavel to Newport (Mon.); cf. *Cal. Close Rolls* (1227–31), p. 373. *Cardiff Records* (ed. Matthews), i. 106—for millstones bought at Tintern for the mill of Rhymney; Thorold Rogers, *Hist. of Agric. Prices*, i. 511, *re* Trillek quarries; cf. *Min. Acc.* 1208–5 for millstones sent to Pembroke from Chepstow.

[7] *Min. Acc.* 1209-6. [8] *Ib.* 24 H. VII. No. 1684.

[9] *Ib.* No. 1685.

[10] *Calendar of Ancient Records of Dublin* (ed. Gilbert), i. 16, 246.

Edward I. allowed his miners of Englefield to take sufficient timber from the royal woods for the founding of lead and other metals.[1] A year later, 1284, a like privilege was given to the burgesses of Flint.[2] After a diligent search, good lead-mines were discovered in the commote of Geneur Glyn, near Aberystwyth.[3] These, however, were not extensively worked owing to the insufficiency of labourers, there being only four 'operators' in 1312.[4] Lead was largely used in the castle works, and also met the small requirements of the fishing-net. The chief sources of supply for the Mid-Wales district were found in the minor workings of the Plinlimmon hills (Morruge) and in the low-lying districts of Montgomery and Shropshire.[5] An inconsiderable amount was imported

[1] *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1281–92, p. 69. For this privilege the miners of Englefield pay an annual fine of 20*s.*, and in return for the wood employed in smelting the Crown took a sixth part of the profit made. The chief mines were at Holywell and Vaynol, the annual profits before the pestilence being about 5*l.* Only 4*s.* is returned for the year following the pestilence, and no more because the greater part of the miners were dead, and those that survived were unwilling to work (*Min. Acc.* 1186–4). The Crown profits (29–31 Edw. III.) amounted to 13*l.* 13*s.* 7*d.* (*Min. Acc.* 1186–13). In the reign of Richard II. no lead was sold, the lead smelted being reserved for the garnishment of the castles and manors of Chester, Flint, and North Wales (*Min. Acc.* 1488–8, 1489–5). Similarly lead was smelted with fuel from the royal woods at Ewloe and Baghegre (*Min. Acc.* 1186–13). One John Hokes farmed the lead-mines of the entire county in 1423 at 3*l.* 18*s.* 9*d.* (*Min. Acc.* 1191–11). The mines of Holywell and Vaynol yielded no profit in 1509, because no one wished to arrent them (*Min. Acc.* 24 H. VII. No. 1590).

[2] *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1281–92), p. 133.

[3] *Min. Acc.* 1218–1. Among the necessary expenses of the Chamberlain appears the following entry: 'Et in conductione diversorum operariorum fodientium et aliis necessariis expensis appositis mense Junii anno præsenti [1301] circa mineram plumbi scrutandam et demum inventam in comoto de Geneurglyn iuxta Lampadarvaur—xiij s. iiij d.'

[4] *Min. Acc.* 1218–9. The following note follows a detailed account of the lead-mine near Llanbadarn: 'Memorandum quod per totum prædictum tempus [referring to a period of five years] non fuerunt nisi quatuor operarii quia plures inveniri non potuerunt. Et cum minera est bona si invenirentur operarii sufficientes.' It is rather disappointing to find no early references to other Cardiganshire lead-mines. These apparently began to be developed at a later date. Lead from the district of Strata Florida was used in repairing the castle of Cardigan in 1451 (*Min. Acc.* 1224–4). See also *Black Book of St. Davids* (ed. J. W. Willis-Bund), p. lxx.

[5] Exchequer Q. R. Acc. 485–20.

from England, Chester[1] and Bristol[2] being the chief ports of supply.

Another commodity, produced in small quantities and occasionally imported, was sea-coal. It was used not so much for the purposes of fuel as in the burning of limestone and the manufacture of iron and other necessaries, such as hinges, nails, locks, &c.[3]

The importance of the scanty references to coal-mining in Wales prior to the reign of Henry VIII. lies not in the extent of the industry which they represent (which was comparatively small), but in the fact that in these little beginnings we have the origin of what is to-day a great factor in British commerce, namely the South Wales coal-field.

We have evidence of collieries at Ewloe,[4] Hopedale, and Mostyn[5] in Flintshire, at Brymbo[6] in Denbigh, and at 'Eskeiviok'[7] in Anglesea. But more especially in South Wales from the forest of Coedtraeth in Pembroke[8] to the

[1] Exchequer Q. R. Acc. 485–21, 486–6; *Min. Acc.* 1212–1. Cf. *Cal. Rot. Pat.* (1281–92), p. 358. Safe-conduct for Thomas le Lou of Newark, Robert his son, Ralph de Byrtune, and other tenants of the county of Chester and the March of Wales, trading to the Isle of Man for lead (*minera*) for the works of the castles in Wales. The lead produced in the Flintshire mines was sometimes specially reserved for this purpose (*Min. Acc.* 1186–13, and 1188–8). Cf. note 1 on the preceding page.

[2] *Arch. Journal*, vii. 239. Lead brought from Bristol to Criccieth and Carnarvon.

[3] *Min. Acc.* 1305–18.

[4] Coal was raised mostly in the demesne lands there, and in the freehold lands of one Blethin ap Ithel Ammel. The mines were farmed in 1349 at 5*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* (*Min. Acc.* 1186–4), rising in 1358 to 6*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* (*Min. Acc.* 1186–13). A similar rent was returned in 1382 (*Min. Acc.* 1188–8), which was increased in 1393 to 9*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* (*Min. Acc.* 1189–9). At a later date the coal profits were included in the general farm of the manors, thereby rendering the coal returns indistinct (*Min. Acc.* 1–2 H. VII. No. 1565).

[5] The coal-mines of the Hopedale district were arrented at 3*l.* in 1393 as in 1359 (*Min. Acc.* 1189–9); those of Mostyn in 1423 at 3*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* (*Min. Acc.* 1191–1).

[6] *Min. Acc.* 16–17 H. VII. No. 1654. Farm of the sea-coal there let to John Puleston at 3*s.* 4*d.*

[7] *Min. Acc.* 1153–6, *s. n.* 'Meney.'

[8] Coal and limestone, of local production, were brought by sea from Pembroke to Cardigan in 1418 (*Min. Acc.* 1222–14). The coal profits at Coedtraeth

forests of Senghenydd, Glynhoddna, Glyntaf, and Rhymney in Monmouth.[1] It was in the forest of Kilvey in Gower that the industry flourished most at this time, the clear profits in 1400 amounting to about 90*l.* per annum. The bailiff's account for this particular year is most minute, and is undoubtedly one of the most important documents we possess relating to the early history of coal-mining in Wales. It sets forth in detail both the method and cost of production.[2]

Sea-coal was imported in small quantities almost invariably for the works of the castle.[3]

Iron was manufactured in various districts,[4] but the

n 1454 (*Rot. Parl.* v. 260) were worth (beyond reprisals) 2*l.* 3*s.* 4*d.*, which were farmed thirty-eight years later (1492) at 2*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* by R. Robyn and Jankyn More. Similar mines were worked at Roch and Pulle, the annual rent in 1478 being 3*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* (*Min. Acc.* 1208-1). One D. Bowen farmed the same in 1492 at 13*s.* 4*d.* (*Min. Acc.* 16–17 H. VII. No. 1650). Interesting and valuable notices of the coal industry in Pembrokeshire will be found in Owen's *Pembrokeshire* (Cymmrodorion Record Series, No. 1, ed. Dr. Henry Owen).

[1] *Min. Acc.* 1202–7. The fact that the South Wales coal field lay so much within the Marcher districts explains the sparse references we have of its early development. The few glimpses we have occur during the minority of an heir, or upon the permanent reversion of a lordship by forfeiture or otherwise into the hands of the Crown. From an inquisition taken upon the death of Gilbert de Clare, it will be seen that the mines at Cevenkarnau were farmed at 20*s.* a year in 1307 (*Cardiff Records*, i. 262). The coal-pits of Llannedu, in the district of Senghenydd, let at 5*s.* in 1314, produced the increased rent of 26*s.* 8*d.* in 1316 (*Min. Acc.* 1202–7). 3*s.* 4*d.* was the total rent of the lower Neath mines in 1492 (*Cardiff Records*, i. 173). Coal was more successfully worked at Wendraeth Vawr, in the lordship of Kidwelly, before 1533, the normal rent of 53*s.* 4*d.* falling to 28*s.* during the year (*Min. Acc.* 24 Hen. VIII. No. 755).

[2] *Min. Acc.* 1202–15. Cf. Inq. post mortem, 3 H. VI. No. 25.

[3] Exchequer Q. R. Acc. 485–27, 486–1 (from Halston), 487–2 (from Tranmere). Cf. Galloway's *Hist. of Coal Mining*, p. 11, and the Chamberlain Accounts of North and South Wales, *passim*.

[4] The native production of iron was sporadic. See Jones's *Hist. of Brecknshire*, p. 538, as to its domestic character. The ironworks of Rhuddlan are first mentioned in Domesday (Ellis's *Introduction to Domesday*, i. 138). Local furnaces are occasionally referred to in connection with the profits of the forest. The royal forges at Dolpenmaen and Penmaghno in Nantconway were farmed by one John Lylie during the reign of Richard II. (*Min. Acc.* 1215–1). The forge of Arddudwy (co. Merioneth) was successfully worked during the years 1418–20 (*Min. Acc.* 1203–10–11). Two Welshmen farmed the iron 'minera' of Ewglysegle (parish of Ruabon, co. Denbigh) at a yearly rent of 3*s.* 4*d.* before 1492 (*Min. Acc.* 17 Hen. VII. No. 1654), and iron ore was extracted from the district of

industry was apparently not very extensive. Spanish iron was frequently imported,[1] in the supply of which as well as of English iron the merchants of Chester played a prominent part.[2]

Before leaving the subject of mining in medieval Wales we may note the want of evidence to illustrate the early working of the Cardiganshire silver-mines. There were two inspectors of silver at Cardigan in 1340,[3] and operations, we are told, were being carried on under improved conditions in the silver-mines of Cwmsymlog in North Cardiganshire about 1587.[4] Less is known of the silver-mines noticed by Giraldus in the district of Flintshire[5] than of those founded by the Earl of Gloucester in Glamorgan.[6]

Other profits issuing from the forest, in addition to pannage and other customary dues, were those received from the commodities of birds and bees. Honey and wax were produced and sold in small quantities. The profits were insignificant, the local markets being well supplied with honey and wax from England, France, and Spain. The royal huntsmen, too, frequently searched the Welsh forests for nests of young falcons, and the well-stocked deer parks were carefully preserved.

This brief outline of the many-sided activity of the forest will perhaps serve to indicate its import in the industrial economy of medieval Wales. It supplied ample fuel for ordinary wants. It yielded sufficient timber and stone for building and repairing purposes; its mining, though developing, fell short of the native demand. All this, tending to the gradual decay of the forest, led to improvement in the general conditions of agriculture and in the means of commercial traffic.

South Irvon (co. Brecon) before, but not during, the year 1509 (*Min. Acc.* 24 H. VII. No. 1607).

[1] Exchequer Q. R. Acc. 486–1, 16–27.

[2] *Ib.* 485–27, 16–27; *Min. Acc.* 1215–5 (iron from the Forest of Dean).

[3] *Cal. Close Rolls* (1339–41), p. 396.

[4] *Landsd. Coll.* (British Museum), 55, pp. 81–82.

[5] *Itin. Kamb.* (Rolls Series), p. 137.

[6] See p. 142 above.

3. *Fisheries.*

We have already referred to the Roman genesis of the fishing industry in Wales.[1] Saving the account of the fisheries of the Wye and the Severn in Domesday Book,[2] little is known of the early fisheries of Wales beyond the fact that early chroniclers include 'fish' in their general lists of the natural products of the country.[3] To this Giraldus Cambrensis adds some curious information of his own.[4]

For new light upon the development of Welsh fisheries we must turn to the story of the town and the monastery. Monastic charters generally empower the monks to erect weirs or take fish in the neighbouring streams. Strata Florida had its weir in the Ystwyth,[5] and the house of Margam took fish in the Avon, the Ely, and the Taff.[6] The Welsh bard, who was not always on friendly terms with the monks, did a little fishing in the smaller streams. A brief description of the net he employed is preserved in one of the Welsh lyrics. Two staves were roughly fastened to a hempen or tow-twined net, with small pieces of lead hanging at the base to keep it down. The bard suggests that such an article was of great advantage in Lent, and incidentally refers to the crowds that flocked around him each Thursday night looking for their Friday's provision.[7]

Fishing assumes a more industrial aspect in the vicinity of a town, where the local market supplied facilities for sale.

[1] P. 123 above. [2] Ellis, *Introduction to Domesday*, i. 142.

[3] *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I.* (Rolls Series), iii. 11; *William of Malmesbury* (Rolls Series), p. 308, '[Wallia] . . . piscium ferax;' *Eulog. Hist.* (Rolls Series), ii. 123, '[Wallia] terra fœcunda . . . piscibus.'

[4] *Itin. Kamb.* (Rolls Series), pp. 33, 114, 136, 171.

[5] *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1422–29), p. 295. *Inspeximus* of a charter (*circa* 1184) including a grant of this privilege.

[6] *History of Margam Abbey* (Birch), pp. 14, 123, 317–8.

[7] Iolo MSS. (Welsh MSS. Soc.), p. 700. A poem to Ivor of Llanufydd requesting a fishing net, by Meredydd ap Rhys, an eminent poet and clergyman who lived at Ruabon in Denbighshire about 1440 (Williams's *Eminent Welshmen*, *s. n.*)

The townsmen of Cardigan, with their home-made coracles, made good money out of the salmon of the Teify; for this privilege they gave four of their best fish to the royal bailiff every year. A few fishermen were similarly employed at a place near by, called Llechryd.[1] The Cilgerran fishery in North Pembroke was one of the most profitable in Wales. The weirs here were destroyed by Edward I, owing to their hindrance to river traffic. They were, however, rebuilt in the next reign on the understanding that sufficient passage be left for ships and boats.[2]

Other towns busily occupied with river fisheries were Conway, Carnarvon, Carmarthen, Cardiff, and Haverford.

The sea-fisheries were inconsiderable. But an abundance of herrings, says the *Brut*, appeared at Aberystwyth in 1206. Twenty-three fishing-boats were engaged there in 1348,[3] and the herring prise (*prisa allecium*) for the following year amounted to thirty shillings.[4] Beaumaris, Barmouth, and Aberdaron were the chief herring ports on the North Wales coast, with Pembroke, Haverford, and notably Tenby on the south coast line.

Merchants of the border towns bringing their merchandise into Wales exchanged their goods, *inter alia*, for fish. Haverford merchants sometimes took their fish[5] to border markets like Abergavenny.[6]

Herrings, white and red, were usually imported from Ireland. Boats from the South Welsh ports did much of the carrying trade between Bristol and Ireland, taking with them the salt and wine deposited at the native ports by alien or native ships, and returning with herrings, hake, salmon, skins, Irish cloth, &c.[7]

[1] *Min. Acc.* 1218–1.
[2] *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1313–17), p. 99.
[3] *Min. Acc.* 1221–7.
[4] *Ib.* 1221–8. Ten years previous to this the '*prisa allecium*' was only 13*s.*, 12*d.* being charged on each meise (*meisa*).
[5] Hereford MSS. (Rep. of Hist. MSS. Com.), p. 287.
[6] *Min. Acc.* 1208–1–5.
[7] See p. 169, below.

4. *The Wool Trade and the Cloth Industry.*

The history of the wool trade in Wales, after 1284, so far as general legislation is concerned, is similar to that of England. Statutes, ordinances, &c., of a general character relating to wool extend to the 'land of Wales,' which term is meant to include the Principality and the Marches.

Customs were leviable on all Welsh wools exported. Cardigan [1] and Haverford [2] were the chief outports for the passage of wools during the reigns of Edward I. and Edward II. Early in the reign of Edward III.[3] the staples for Wales were fixed at Shrewsbury, Carmarthen, and Cardiff. Customs accounts for Wales before the reign of Henry VIII. are unfortunately very rare. Only five fragmentary accounts have survived, all belonging to the reign of Edward II., and relating solely to the port of Haverford.[4] The account for 1320[5] is seemingly complete, and shows that 119½ sacks were exported during the year. Cardiff, being the capital of a Marcher lordship, ceased to be a staple town in 1332, when staples were ordered to be held in the king's towns only.[6] Shrewsbury was still the chief wool market for Mid-Wales, as was Carmarthen for the South. No customs were levied in the North Welsh district until 1339,[7] when the port of Carnarvon was made subsidiary to the Rhuddlan staple, but we have little evidence of its administration.[8]

[1] *History of the Customs Revenue* (Hubert Hall), ii. 17.

[2] Haverford is the only Welsh staple town mentioned in the list of staples for 1326, from which wool, woolfells, &c., could be taken to parts beyond sea, *Cal. Close Rolls* (1323–27), p. 585. Shrewsbury and Carmarthen were Welsh staple towns six years later, *ib.* (1330–33), p. 525.

[3] *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1327–30), p. 98.

[4] *Customs Acc.* (P.R.O.), Bundle 48–1–5.

[5] *Ib.* No. 2.

[6] *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1330–33), p. 362.

[7] *Cal. Close Rolls* (1337–39), p. 199. Thomas de Upton was the first controller of the customs there, appointed September 30, 1339, during pleasure, with such wages as the controllers in the ports of England had used to receive, on condition that he write his rolls with his own hand, stay there continually, and execute the office himself (*Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1338–40), p. 321).

[8] There are no 'coket' returns for Carnarvon before the time of Henry VII.;

There is reason to believe that the amount of Welsh wool exported was at no time considerable. The Welsh sheep were small, and, excepting those of Radnor,[1] they were of the worst staple. The wools in the parts of Wales are described in 1341 as being 'coarse and of little value, so that for their poorness they are not numbered among wools of any sort of the realm of England.'[2] They were seldom included in the grants of wools made to the Crown by Parliament. Foreign merchants rarely visited Wales, and, excepting the Welsh wools consigned to Flemish markets by some of the Welsh monastic houses,[3] comparatively little was exported, particularly during the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

The Statute Staple of 1353 made Carmarthen the sole staple for Wales. This adoption of a common centre, no doubt, was more convenient for foreign traders, but the policy was not a success. Welshmen found a difficulty in disposing of their surplus wools at the central staple, owing to the paucity of buyers. Welsh merchants who purchased their wools of the country-folk in local fairs were therefore allowed to bring their wools to English staples, but they had first to be sealed (or cocketed) at the Carmarthen staple.[4] This department of the Carmarthen staple is generally termed the 'staple over the mountains to England,' in contradistinction to the ordinary 'staple by sea.' The inconvenience of this arrangement will be obvious if, for instance, a merchant of North Wales were compelled to go to Carmarthen before passing with his goods to an English

the necessary apparatus (balance and weights) had not been received in 1341 (*Min. Acc.* 1213–14). A few returns exist for the staple at Rhuddlan showing the export of small quantities of Flintshire wools in 1394, 1396, 1397, 1398, 1400 (*Min. Acc.* 1215–5–9). Wools were exported from Beaumaris, subject to the regulations of the Rhuddlan staple, in 1451 (*Min. Acc.* 1216–18), 1466 (1217–4), and 1468 (1217–5).

[1] *Cambrian Quarterly Mag.* iv. 401.

[2] *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1341–43), p. 272. *Cf.* Chetham Soc. Publ. xlvi. 973.

[3] *The Growth of English Industry and Commerce* (Dr. Cunningham), vol. i. App. D; *Hist. of Margam Abbey* (Birch), p. 257.

[4] *Statutes of the Realm* (Rec. Com.), i. 340.

staple. It also often led to unjust exactions. The restriction was ultimately repealed by the Black Prince, who allowed his loyal Welshmen free access to the English staples.[1]

A few returns for the Carmarthen staple are preserved amongst the Public Records.

In 1356 the customs[2] on wool, woolfells, hides, &c., amounted to 156*l.* 18*s.* 10½*d.*; 1357, 147*l.* 4*s.* 0¼*d.*; in 1359 we have the highest total, 215*l.* 12*s.* 0¾*d.*; 1316, 189*l.* 2*s.* 0¼*d.*; 1362, 117*l.* 3*s.* 6*d.*[3] At some date subsequent to these returns, and before the year 1379, the 'staple over the mountains' was abolished.[4] The returns for this and the succeeding years were for the 'sea staple' only, and are as follows:—1379, 31*l.* 5*s.* 4½*d.*;[4] 1380, 30*l.* 10*s.* 9½*d.*;[5] 1381, 13*l.* 2*s.* 9*d.*;[6] 1382, *nil*;[7] 1383, 15*l.* 15*s.* 6¼*d.*;[8] 1385, 3*l.* 0*s.* 8¼*d.*; 1386, 15*l.* 10*s.* 7*d.*;[9] 1387, 12*l.* 4*s.* 2*d.*;[10] 1390, 17*l.* 3*s.* 5*d.*;[11] 1391, 14*l.* 10*s.* 3*d.*; 1395, 16*l.* 16*s.* 8*d.*; 1397, 27*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.*; 1401, 10*l.* 17*s.* 9*d.*[12]

No returns exist for the period covered by the insurrection of Owen Glyndwr. After this revolt the Carmarthen staple seems to lose its distinctiveness, and accounts for its customs as an ordinary port. It is nominally termed a staple in 1423.[13]

[1] *Min. Acc.* 1306–2.

[2] The issues of the 'coket' at Carmarthen were farmed by one Nicholas Legge in 1349 and 1350 at 6*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*; in 1351 and 1352 by Robert de Cheddre and Reginald le Ffrenssh at 40*l.* a year, this presumably including both departments of the staple (*Min. Acc.* 1306–1). This account (23–24 Edward III.) purports to be 'of the year next after the pestilence,' thus placing the date of the pestilence in South Wales at 1349–50. The customs of the Carmarthen staple tally with those of the English staple towns; for each sack of wool 6*s.* 8*d.*, for every 300 woolfells 6*s.* 8*d.*, for each 'diker' (including 10 *corii*) of hides 8*d.* (*Min. Acc.* 1222–9), for each last of hides 13*s.* 4*d.* (*Min. Acc.* 1223–10).

[3] *Min. Acc.* 1221–9–13 respectively.

[4] *Min. Acc.* 1306–2. A note to this effect is included in the Chamberlain's account for this year. Some time before its dissolution the profits of this branch of the staple were farmed at 5*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* per annum.

[5] 1306–3. [6] 1221–14. [7] 1306–6. [8] 1306–4.

[9] 1221–15, 16. [10] 1222–1. [11] 1306–5. *Cf.* 1222–3.

[12] 1222–5, 6, 7–8, 9.

[13] *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1422–29), p. 181. Licence to John Langley, a merchant of Bristol, to ship wools bought in Wales from the staple of Carmarthen to Bristol and thence across the sea to Calais. In 1432 John Langley transported 61 sacks

During the reigns of Henry VI. and Edward IV. very little export trade was done in Welsh wools.[1]

The explanation (apart from circumstances attending the wars of the Roses and other political disturbances) lies, perhaps in the fact that the Welsh wools were mostly utilised by the native fulling mills. These reach the climax of their activity during the later Middle Ages.

The great falling off in the export duties on wools would seem to be hardly compatible with the tendency to convert arable into pasture land at this time,[2] were it not for the evidence of the growth of a considerable cloth industry in Wales.

Cloth-weaving was one of the domestic arts of the early Welsh. The story of its development reveals one common trait in the development of industry and commerce in Wales, namely, the gradual expulsion of family notions from Welsh economy. In the domain of agriculture we may perceive this in the ordinary circumstance of grinding corn. The hand-mill or quern of the homestead is gradually superseded by the hamlet or district mill.[3] In trade it is evident from the centralisation of the commercial transactions of the

of wool in divers ships from the port of Chepstow, together with 41 dikers of 'salted hides' from the *port* of Carmarthen (*Min. Acc.* 1223–6).

[1] *Min. Acc.* 1223–5 (2 H. VI.), 8–9 (13 H. VI.), 10 (15 H. VI.); * 1224–1 (27 H. VI.),* 2–3 (36 H. VI.),* 5 (1 Edw. IV.),* 6 (2 Edw. IV.),* 7 (3 Edw. IV.),* 9 (6 Edw. IV.),* 1225–1 (7 Edw. IV.),* 2 (8 Edw. IV.),* 3 (13 Edw. IV.),* 4 (14 Edw. IV.); * 5 (15 Edw. IV.),* 6 (16 Edw. IV.), 7 (19 Edw. IV.), 8 (21 Edw. IV.). All the enumerated accounts are those of the Chamberlains of South Wales, which usually include the customs received in ports on the maritime coast between Aberystwyth and Carmarthen. During these particular years the 'custom' on wool, woolfells, and hides was 'nothing' (*nulla*), with the exception that three lasts of hides were customed (*custumata*) at Carmarthen in 1437, as were two sacks of wool and four dikers of hides at the port of Haverford in 1467 (*Min. Acc.* 1224–8). In the accounts marked with an asterisk no prisage of wine was taken.

[2] P. 138, note 2, above.

[3] See *Court Rolls* (P.R.O.), Portf. 215–49, mm. 5 and 9; *ib.* Portf. 215–6, m. 4 (dorse), for instances of tenants fined for holding hand-mills (*mola manualis*), year 1322. Hand-mill stones were hard to find in Wales in 1301 (*Min. Acc.* 1218–1). See *Ancient Laws and Institutes of Wales* (Rec. Com.), p. 31, where every house had its quern or hand-mill.

homestead to the towns. What the town did for trade, the fulling mills, and later the factory, did for the weaving industry.

The *de-domestication* of Welsh economy was the inevitable result of the extension of feudal ideas into Wales. The idea of the manor gradually supplanted that of the tribe in agriculture, industry, and trade. The environment of feudal economy was more fixed, and its organisation more central, and therefore more conducive to economic and commercial development.

The consideration of the weaving industry in Wales may be divided into three periods, according as its place of operation was the homestead, the fulling mill, and the factory.

During the early period weaving was one of the many activities of the homestead. Instruction to all members of the kin in this domestic art formed one of the important functions which the headman of the kindred had to fulfil. The industry during this period, we may take it, was promiscuously scattered over the inhabited parts of tribal Wales, where the wools and flax of local growth were wrought by the native looms into articles of clothing and other necessaries of domestic use. Members of the royal households received their woollen garments from the king and their linen garments from the queen.[1] The early Welsh were also adepts at making a rough kind of cloth or blanket called *brychan*. But they were no manufacturers: Giraldus makes a special point of this.[2] There was apparently little or no production of cloth for purposes of gain. In fact, English cloth was one of the necessaries imported into Wales at this time.[3]

Circumstances attending the Norman conquest imparted new vigour to the industry. The introduction of the new monasteries, with their improved conditions of farming, led to a more successful growth of wool, and the superior skill of the monk artisan is said to have improved the native art of weaving.[4] The plantation of the Flemish colony of artisans

[1] *Ancient Laws and Institutes* (Rec. Com.), pp. 3, 145, 147, 180, 651.
[2] *Descr. Kamb.* (Rolls Series), p. 184, and p. 128, note 2, above.
[3] *Ib.* pp. 218–19.
[4] *Hist. of Neath Abbey* (Birch), p. 29.

in Pembrokeshire had a like effect, notwithstanding the racial antipathy that must have thwarted their early efforts. Giraldus particularly commends the industrial energy and the commercial instinct of these people.[1] We find that Welsh cloth (called '*keyneth*') was bought for the everyday use of Bishop Swinfield's household at Hereford in 1290.[2]

With the appearance of fulling mills in the fourteenth and following centuries, Welsh cloth came to be manufactured upon a scale that soon made it the most considerable and at the same time the most important article of Welsh trade.

Fulling mills appear in Wales early in the reign of Edward II., just at the time when fulling mills were being introduced into Lancashire.[3]

These first appear in the South Welsh districts in the track of the Flemings between Bristol and Pembroke. By the close of the century mills were fairly well distributed throughout the whole of Wales—particularly in the Marcher districts of Gwent,[4] Morganwg,[5] Gower,[6] Pembroke,[7] Brecon

[1] *Itin. Camb.* (Rolls Series), p. 83 and note 2.

[2] *Roll of the Household Expenses of Bishop Swinfield*, 1289-90 (Camden Soc.), i. 111. 'In iiij pannis de keyneth, quorum unus erat pro domino, xix li. vj s. viij d.' Keyneth,' a sort of coarse Welsh cloth, a strong cloth for ordinary wear (*ib.* vol. ii. Glossary, *q.v.*).

[3] *Chetham Society Publications*, xliii. 637. *Cf.* the Pipe Roll of the Bishopric of Winchester, 1208–9. Introd. xxvii, as to the earliest recorded fulling mills in England.

[4] There were fulling mills at Usk and Caerleon-on-Usk in 1314 (*Min. Acc.* 1202–6); the former was rebuilt after a prolonged decay in 1517, in which year the latter mill was farmed at 13*s.* 4*d.* (*Min. Acc.* 7 H. VII. No. 87). Mills appear at Maghay (Magor) and Deffren Ebor in 1316 (*Min. Acc.* 1202–7), and at Rhymney about 1458 (*Min. Acc.* 14 H. VII. No. 1662).

[5] The fulling mill in the manor of Cardiff was not built in 1314, being probably the one referred to in the next account, 1316 (*Min. Acc.* 1202–7), as not yet built in the manor of Roath (*Cardiff Records*, i. 108). Mills were established at Miskin and Llanblethian before 1314, and were successfully farmed in 1316, Miskin at 53*s.* 4*d.*, Llanblethian at 50*s.* In this same year the fulling mill of Caerphilly realised a rent of 53*s.* 4*d.* For other instances of early fulling mills in Glamorgan, see *History of Margam Abbey* (Birch), pp. 304, 305.

[6] The mill of 'Landymore' in West Gower was rented at 30*s.* in 1400 (*Hist. of West Gower*, J. D. Davies, ii. 143), that of Swansea at the same date yielding sixpence less (*Min. Acc.* 1202–15).

[7] Excepting the mill at Lawhaden in 1326 (*Black Book of St. Davids*, ed. J. W. Willis-Bund, p. 137), no early references to the Pembrokeshire fulling

and Radnor,[1] Denbigh,[2] and Powysland.[3] Early fulling mills were established near Carmarthen,[4] and in the district of Newcastle Emlyn.[5] Cardiganshire had early representatives in the weavers (*textores*) of its county town,[6] in fulling mills at Lanienyth,[7] and at a place near the town of Lampeter.[8] Clothmen appear in the vicinity of Llanrhystyd in 1344.[9]

mills survive. That of Cameros was in decay in 1393 (*Min. Acc.* 1305–10), and those of Coedtraeth were farmed at 20*s.* long before 1505 (*Min. Acc.* 16–17 H. VII. No. 1650). A new fulling mill was constructed at Haverford in 1478 (*Min. Acc.* 1208–1).

[1] We have evidence of fulling mills at Knighton and Norton in 1340 (*Min. Acc.* 1208–9), the annual farm of the mill at Knighton being 13*s.* 4*d.* In 1474 it was let to one Philip ap Meredith, his heirs and assigns, for ninety years at a yearly rent of 3*s.* 4*d.* The mills of Kington and Hengoed, usually farmed at 13*s.* 4*d.* each, were in decay in 1495, as was that of 'English Hay,' a mill profitably worked during the later half of the fifteenth century (*Min. Acc.* 10 H. VII. No. 1652); it probably remained in this state for a considerable time, as in 1517 the same mill is accounted for as being in decay for many years (*Min. Acc.* 8 H. VIII. No. 51). Abergavenny mill was rented at 4*s.* in 1509 (*Min. Acc.* 24 H. VII. No. 1666). During this year a fulling mill appears near Pain's Castle in Elvael (*Min. Acc.* 24 H. VII. No. 1662).

[2] Clothmen sometimes appear among the suitors mentioned in the famous series of Ruthin Court Rolls. In 1335 Welsh weavers got leave to erect a fulling mill at 'Wenhannok Canon' (Seebohm's *Tribal System in Wales*, App. Bb. p. 56). A fulling mill at Hope was arrented at 2*l.* per annum in 1372 (*Min. Acc.* 1188–8), and there were private fulling mills at 'Doleth' and Kenvanvas in the vill of Ecclesham about 1436 (*Min. Acc.* 7 H. VIII. No. 5). The site of a new fulling mill in Mersforde and Allington was let at 6*s.* 8*d.* to one David ap Eden Bannor in 1502 (*Min. Acc.* 17 H. VII. No. 1654). Much of the wools of Flintshire was no doubt woven in the fulling mills on the Dee. These were farmed in 1529 at 11*l.* a year (*Min. Acc.* 19–20 H. VIII. No. 43).

[3] A fulling mill is mentioned at Newtown about 1337 (*Min. Acc.* 1209–1). Its annual farm before 1498 was 10*s.*, after which date it remained in decay for at least thirteen years (*Min. Acc.* 2 H. VIII. No. 22). The fulling mills at Kedewain and Ralltissa in Tregynon were also in a decayed state at this date (1498). In the latter district the descendants of one John Bannor paid a small sum for the privilege of erecting their fulling mill. The corn and fulling mills of Manafon with the demesne lands there were held by Cadwalader and Maurice, the sons of Owen, at 21*s.* There were in addition two fulling mills in decay in the rhingildry of 'Eginlle,' but, for one lately built on the bank of the Miwl (*Moylle*), one John ap Ieuan Bannor paid a rent of 13*s.* 4*d.* (*Min. Acc.* 12–13 H. VII. No. 1686).

[4] *Min. Acc.* 1219–11 (date 1321).

[5] *Ib.* 1219–8 (date 1319).

[6] *Court Rolls* (P.R.O.), Portf. 215-20 (date 1303).
Black Book of St. Davids, as above, p. 261 (date 1326).
Min. Acc. 1160–5 (date 1417).

[9] *Court Rolls* (P.R.O.), Portf. 215-25.

There were not many in the three counties of North Wales. The industry in these districts seems to have retained its purely domestic character to a later date. We find occasional reference, in the Court of Rolls of this district, to women amerced for selling cloth outside the market.[1] An Anglesea weaver, Ieuan Whith, joined the revolt of Glyndwr. The value of his weaving implement (*instrumentum texendi*), that was forfeited in consequence, was two pence.[2] However, we read of a fulling mill at Castell Math, near Nevin, in 1422,[3] and of another in a decayed state through want of repairs at Trefriw in 1469,[4] its normal rent being about 5*s.* per annum. A comparatively profitable mill called 'Pandy Kwryryon,' yielding a yearly rent of 26*s.* 8*d.*, appears in the commote of Ughaph in 1524.[5]

The mills, it would appear, were somewhat evenly distributed between town and country, though they exhibit little partiality for the free boroughs. The majority were manorial or district mills. Thus, not to mention several instances already quoted, we find a fulling mill in the district of Cwmtauddwr,[6] but not in the town of Rhayader. The mill in the rural district of Manafon was in a flourishing condition in 1498, when the old mill of Newtown was in utter decay.[7] The forest of Pennant harboured a fulling mill at 'Kenvynvas' as did the forest of Glyncothy at 'Melyn Cludagh,'[8] and there were two mills near by, not in the town of Carmarthen.[9] It is somewhat remarkable that no fulling mills are to be found in the North Welsh boroughs. They appear commonly in little village and Marcher towns, as Berriew,[10] Chirk,[11] Knighton, Llanblethian, &c.

[1] *Court Rolls* (P.R.O.), Portf. 215-49, *s.n.* 'Uwchgwyrvai' and 'Gafflogion.'

[2] *Min. Acc.* 1233–1. See the account of Richard de Wode, the escheator of Anglesea.

[3] *Min. Acc.* 1177–2. [4] *Ib.* 1181–1. [5] *Ib.* 24–5 H. VIII. No. 14.

[6] The mill yielded no profit in 1502 (*Min. Acc.* 16–17 H. VII. No. 1650.

[7] *Min. Acc.* 12–13 H. VII. No. 1686. [8] *Ib.* 1–2 H. VII. No. 1627.

[9] *Min. Acc.* 7 H. VIII. No. 17.

[10] In decay 1510 (*Min. Acc.* 1–2 H. VIII. No. 22).

[11] *Min. Acc.* 6–7 H. VIII. No. 56. No profits this year because the mill had fallen to the ground. The mill of Glynvychan, near Llangollen, was held by the tenants of that district at a farm of 11*s.* 8*d.*

The chief markets for Welsh cloth, excepting Llanerchymedd [1] in Anglesea, and Ruthin [2] in Denbigh, were in the English borders of Oswestry, Shrewsbury, Hereford, Ludlow, and Bristol in particular. It would appear from the ulnage accounts of the counties in which these towns are placed, as well as from the custom accounts of Bristol, that the Welsh cloth trade reached its zenith during the fifteenth century.

Oswestry and Shrewsbury drew largely from the district of Powys and Merioneth, thus receiving the cloths manufactured from the wools produced in the vales of the Vyrnwy, Severn, and the Dovey. Welshpool was often the common meeting-place of Shrewsbury merchants and Welsh clothiers from the mountain districts of Arwystli (Llanidloes) and Cyveiliog (Machynlleth).[3]

The drapers of Elvael carried their blankets to the Hereford market.[4] The farmer of the Bouthall there made the best part of his annual rent from the packs of cloth brought thither by the 'frisemen' of Wales.[5] The Ludlow markets were generally patronised by the Knighton clothiers.[6]

Welsh merchants occasionally carried their cloths to the English counties adjoining the Marches. The ulnage returns of the counties of Stafford,[7] Leicester,[8] Warwick,[9] Wilts,[10] Bucks,[11] Worcester,[12] and Northampton,[13] all yield glimpses of the Welsh cloth trade. Some of the more enterprising clothiers brought their Welsh russets to the well-known Fair of St. Bartholomew in London.[14]

[1] *Min. Acc.* 1229–8.

[2] *Ruthin Court Rolls* (P.R.O.), Portf. 221–4, m. 24. Reference in 1399 to a grant of the tolls of Ruthin to one Llewelyn Gogh and two copartners, excepting the toll arising from cloths exposed at the fairs ('excepto tolneto de panno infra lez seldes ad nundinas').

[3] *Powysland Club Collections*, xxiv. 185.

[4] Exchequer Q. R. Acc. 339–14 (date 1423), 15 (date 1418).

[5] *Hereford MSS.* (Rep. of Hist. MSS. Com.), p. 327.

[6] Exchequer Q. R. Acc. 344–18 (date 1430).

[7] *Ib.* 344–18.

[8] *Ib.* 339–22 (date 1422, 1427).

[9] *Ib.* 344–25 (date 1398).

[10] *Ib.* 345–4 (H. IV.).

[11] *Ib.* 338–1 (date 1368).

[12] *Ib.* 345–11.

[13] *Ib.* 343–19.

[14] Exchequer Q. R. Acc. 341–3 (date 1419, 1424), 341–18 (date 1444–46), 342–3 (date 1522).

But Bristol was the chief emporium for Welsh cloth. Almost all the cloths manufactured in the South Welsh district were brought hither,[1] together with some from the Marcher and Mid-Wales districts by the Marcher merchants.[2] The export trade in Welsh cloth was almost entirely confined to Bristol. Small quantities were sometimes exported from Carnarvon and Beaumaris.[3] From the time of Edward III., the Bristol customs accounts contain valuable information on this subject. The largest amount exported thence in one year is perhaps found in the returns of 1494, when the total value of Welsh cloth was £815 17*s.* 6*d.*[4] The trade extended to such foreign countries as Flanders,[5] Brittany,[6] Gascony,[7] and other parts of France, Spain,[8] and Iceland,[9] with or without a due regard for the monopoly of the Staple of Calais.

The returns during the reign of Henry VIII. fall off considerably. After this, the chief interest of the trade is transferred to the North and Marcher districts. George Owen, the celebrated historian of Pembrokeshire, deplores the decay of the industry in his native county, the wools of the lower districts being then (1602) transported to Bristol, whilst those of the upper districts were sold at the fairs of Cardigan to the North Wales men, who wrought cloth thereof for the Shrewsbury merchants.[10] An interesting struggle took place a little later between Shrewsbury and Oswestry for

[1] Exchequer Q. R. Acc. 339–11, 12.

[2] *Ib.* 339–14; *Customs Acc.* (Bristol), 19–14.

[3] See the Chamberlain's Accounts of North Wales from the time of Henry VII. onwards, e.g. *Min. Acc.* 7 H. VII. No. 1592.

[4] *Customs Acc.* (Bristol), 20–9.

[5] *Ib.* 17–6 (1404), 19–3 (1466), 20–5 (1486), 21–1 (1517).

[6] *Ib.* 19–14 (1487).

[7] *Ib.* 16–10 (1382), 16–14 (1384); Bayonne, *ib.* 16–5 (1380), 17–6 (1404), 17–10 (1406); Bordeaux, *ib.* 17–6, 17–10, 18–28 (1431), 19–2 (1461), 19–3 (1466), 19–14 (1487), 20–5 (1486).

[8] *Ib.* 16–26 (1396), 16–30 (1397), 17–10, 19–2, 19–4 (1466), 19–13, 19–14, 20–1 (1483), 20–5, 20–7 (1488). These accounts include several consignments of Welsh cloth to Portugal.

[9] *Ib.* 19–13 (1487).

[10] Owen's *Pembrokeshire* (as above), p. 57.

the monopoly of the Welsh cloth market.[1] Both were handicapped by the growing activity of the North Welsh ports.[2]

Whilst the cloth industry was successfully carried on in the Mid- and North-Wales districts, great strides were being made in the development of the South Wales coalfield. Medieval Wales gave cloth and received coal. The movement had now begun by which this was to be reversed. Modern Wales gives coal and receives cloth. The factory system, through the agency of coal in one instance, has all but replaced the native fulling mill.

It may be noted that during this period English,[3] Flemish,[4] and Irish cloths[5] were imported into Wales in small quantities, as also was canvas or a rough kind of cloth from Brittany.[6]

5. *The Towns.*

We may look at the medieval towns of Wales from three points of view : economic, political, and commercial.

(*a*) *Economic Aspect.*

All the towns were more or less engaged in agricultural and pastoral pursuits. They derived their especial importance from the relation in which they stood to the administration, industry, and trade of the country.

[1] For a concise account of this, see *Influence and Development of English Gilds* (F. A. Hibbert), pp. 89–97. Cf. *Shropshire Arch. Soc. Trans.* iii. (1880), 132 *et seq.*

[2] *Ib.* p. 135.

[3] *Min. Acc.* 1222–7–8. Every 'entire' English cloth brought to the port of Carnarvon was liable to a duty of 2*s.* 6*d.*; the corresponding custom on Welsh cloth was 2*s.* (*Min. Acc.*, 7 H. VII. No. 1592).

[4] *Min. Acc.* 1223–9.

[5] Irish cloth, through the medium of Bristol, was probably imported into Wales at a comparatively early date. It is included in the long and interesting list of articles upon which the townsmen of Crickhowell were empowered to levy a murage toll in 1281 (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, (1281–1292), p. 2). Welsh cloth, on the other hand, finds a place in the murage custumals of Dublin towards the middle of the fourteenth century. See *Calendar of Ancient Records of Dublin* (ed. Gilbert), i. 15, 243.

[6] *Min. Acc.* 10–11 H. VIII. No. 115.

Some were dignified with a castle, or even with a chancery and exchequer, and played a part in the administration of the country. Several were marked by the industrial activity of a fulling mill or of a local tannery. Others, from their favourable situation on the sea-coast, were especially adapted for commerce, their ports being the national avenues for the export and import of merchandise. Carnarvon derived its chief importance from the place it held in the administration of the Principality. To this Carmarthen could add a decided precedence in matters of trade, whereas Haverford could go one further, and add its industrial activity, though at the same time falling below Carnarvon and Carmarthen in administrative pomp. Cardiff, Swansea, and other capital towns of Marcher lordships played an important rôle in one or more of these three spheres in their respective districts.

(*b*) *Political Aspect.*

From the political point of view the history of several of the Welsh towns has an especial interest which is not without its bearing on the national commerce.

Some of the towns, in addition to being the local centres of administration (a condition in itself favourable to trade,[1] were garrison towns, dependent to a great extent upon foreign marts.[2] These were the English boroughs, like Carnarvon, Beaumaris, and Carmarthen, &c., in which no Welshmen were supposed to reside.[3] Loyal Welshmen, however, were seldom refused admission to the privileges of the English boroughs until the revolt of Glyndwr occasioned the promulgation of a series of statutes by Henry IV. forbidding Welshmen, *inter alia*, to become burgesses of an English

[1] *E.g.* the English burgesses of Cardigan complain that the men of the county do not do suit there (*Ancient Petitions*, P.R.O., No. 4187), a circumstance which affected their trade; much of their merchandise being sold to suitors at the 'court English' held there monthly (*ib.* No. 4886). Cf. *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1385–1389), p. 114.

[2] See below, pp. 166–7.

[3] Cf. *Pec. of Carn.* p. 137.

borough in Wales.[1] Henry VI. in a similar manner further disfranchised the North Welsh for their disloyalty in 1444.[2]

This continual identification of the enjoyment of commercial privileges with racial distinction placed the conditions of internal trade upon an unequal footing. One of the weak links in the medieval trade of Wales was the disparity of privileges. Under the Tudors the two races were placed on an equal footing in this respect.

(*c*) *Commercial Aspect.*

The following consideration of the town in its commercial aspect is purposely a confined one. It treats briefly of the towns and industry (*a*), and the towns in their relation to internal (*b*) and external (*c*) trade respectively.

(a) *The Towns and Industry.* The towns in their relation to the fisheries as well as to the wool trade and the cloth industry have been already touched upon. Tanning, with its allied industries. formed the next important branch of town industry. In this the Welsh towns were favoured by the native supply of bark and skins. Tanners, glovers, shoemakers, saddlers, clothiers, and tuckers casually occur in the scattered notices that remain of Welsh townsmen in the Middle Ages, but there is little or no evidence to indicate that these individuals were members of any particular craft gilds. Town industries were apparently in the hands of individual burgesses, who found sufficient facility for trading by the fact that they were members of the merchant gild of the borough. In this connection it must be remembered that the Welsh boroughs were small, and the merchant gilds may well have been co-extensive with them. Trade disputes in

[1] Loyal Welshmen were still allowed, by special licence, to reside or hold lands in English cities and English towns in Wales. See *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1422–29), p. 476.

[2] *Rot. Parl.* v. 138–9. All grants of franchises, markets, fairs, and other freedoms to buy or sell or bake or brew to sell within the towns of North Wales, made to any Welshman before this time, made void and of no value.

Wales are due more to the conflict of town *v.* country[1] than gild *v.* gild, and there seems to be no great risk of omitting much by postponing the history of craft gilds in Wales to the late sixteenth and following centuries. It is at the same time true that Edward II. founded gilds of cordwainers and glovers at Cardiff in 1323, but the extant evidence of their actual working is of a much later date.[2] The same may be said of the craft gilds of Brecon.[3]

(b) *The Towns and Internal Trade.* The continued growth of commercial privileges in Wales is an outstanding feature of the fourteenth century. Market and fair privileges were freely bestowed upon the village towns,[4] and the gild merchant was nominally established in the Welsh free boroughs.[5] Occasional conflicts enlivened the process. The burgesses of the old royal town of Montgomery looked askance at the rise of the mesne marts of Oswestry, Welshpool, and Newtown, which gave a lasting blow to their monopoly of trade in low-lying districts of Powysland. The Crown came to their aid in putting down the proposed market at Abermule, and the illegally set-up market at Chirbury.[6] The privileges granted to the burgesses of the new town of Carmarthen led to an interesting conflict with the Prior and Convent there.[7]

The extant evidence of the gild merchant during this period illustrates little besides the fact of its expansion. Markets and fairs were of course the chief organs of internal trade. The toll returns that have survived are of local rather than general interest, and in those cases where they have

[1] See below, p. 165, also *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1313–17), pp. 322, 325; *ib.* (1330–34), p. 298.

[2] *Cardiff Records*, iii. 336–404.

[3] Jones's *Hist. of Brecon*, pp. 181–3.

[4] See Palmer's *List and Indexes*, No. 93.

[5] Gross, *Gild Merchant*, i. 244–53. Cf. *Influence and Development of English Gilds* (F. A. Hibbert), pp. 25–28, a list of merchant gilds in Wales down to 1485.

[6] *Powysland Club Collections*, i. 44; *Record of Carn.* p. 222; *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1225–32), p. 121; *ib.* (1313–17), p. 318, and p. 131, note 10, above.

[7] *Ancient Petitions* (P.R.O.), Nos. 5908, 5909, 5910.

escaped the indistinctness of a fee-farm or yearly rent, yield valuable evidence of the comparative activity of local towns at this time. They seldom throw much light upon the character of trade. In this respect, murage accounts, when given in detail, are particularly good.[1] Incidental light is thrown on the internal trading of West Wales by a series of petitions in connection with the dispute between the Prior and Burgesses of Carmarthen,[2] as also by an instructive petition from the burgesses of Aberystwyth, touching their conflict with the men of the surrounding country who persisted in contracting their bargains at home.[3] The occasional amercements for illicit trading *in patria* or outside of the markets and fairs noted in the local Court Rolls add to the information.

Horses, cattle, sheep, pigs, wool, cheese and butter form the common articles of sale, with wheat, oats, and leather in scarcer quantities. From the side of the country it was chiefly articles of pastoral produce, the exchange of which for articles of small merchandise and other necessaries of life and of occasional luxury was the chiefest function of the medieval townsmen.

Provincial trade, moreover, was not entirely in the hands of the burgess or townsman. There were the chensers (*censarii*), a commercial class that often resided in the provincial hamlets, paying a yearly tax for the faculty of buying and selling in the commotes or hundreds in which their hamlets were situated. These were particularly common in the district of Cardiganshire and North Carmarthen,[4] but their status in the former county was threatened by the

[1] E.g. *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1272–81), p. 248 (Montgomery); *ib.* (1281–92), p. 2 *et seq.* (Crickhowell).

[2] See note 7 on preceding page.

[3] *Ancient Petitions* (P.R.O.), No. 11883.

[4] There were chensers at Castell Gwallter (in Geneurglyn): [Llanvihangel y Creuddyn (in Creuddyn)]; Llanrhystyd (in Hanniniog): Llanilar (Mevenydd); Melindref and Llanybyther (Mabwynnion) and Llanarth (Gwynionnyth), all in Cardiganshire. Also at Cynwil and Mabelwern, in the *patria* of Cantrefmawr. They were generally few in number (*Min. Acc.* 1218–1).

municipal policy of Edward I.[1] Chensers attended the fairs of Pembroke,[2] Tenby,[2] and Newport [3] (Mon.) in large numbers, and frequently augment the tolls of small market towns like Rhayader [4] and Pain's Castle.[5] There was also apparently a class of town chensers, hardly distinguishable from the burgess *de vento et vico*, whose status is not at all clear.

In addition to the local burgesses and chensers there appears in the lordship of Builth towards the close of the fifteenth century a class of strange or travelling chapmen called 'portmen' (*portmaniyeut*), who pay a small toll for trading in the *patria* or lordship of Builth.[6]

(c) *The Towns and External Trade.* The towns in their relation to external trade are dealt with in the following section.

II. External Trade.

Welsh exports consisted chiefly of wool, woolfells, cloth, hides, skins, butter, cheese, and herbs (*cimil'* ?).[7]

Welsh imports in a general sense comprised :—

(1) Commodities produced at home, but not in sufficient quantities to cope with the native demand, namely iron, lead, coal, corn, wax, and honey.[8]

[1] Chensers were prohibited to sell in the hamlet of Llanvihangel y Creuddyn because it was within the liberties of the borough of Llampadarn (*Min. Acc.* 1158–1). There were no chenser profits at Llanilar in 1329 and 1334 because there was nobody in that hamlet, who bought, sold, or kept a tavern, for a long time (*Min. Acc.* 1220–5, 7).

[2] *Min. Acc.* 1208–5.

[3] *Min. Acc.* 19–20 H. VII. No. 1665.

[4] *Min. Acc.* 16–17 H. VII. No. 1681 ('et de ij d. de novo redditu Gr ap Atha ap Hoell Lloargh chenc[arius] pro licencia mercandizandum infra libertates villæ de Raidour quamdiu sibi placuerit').

[5] *Min. Acc.* 23–24 H. VII. No. 1662.

[6] *Min. Acc.* 23–24 H. VII. No. 1667. The reference is interesting for the light which it throws upon the meaning of the term 'tolnetum patriæ' (*Arch. Camb.* 3rd Series, ii. 27) as being the toll paid by strangers trading within a lordship or *patria* (? tribal district).

[7] 12 lbs. of 'cimil'' [? cumila = herb] exported from Carmarthen by Peter de Haundescote, a Flemish merchant, in 1357, customed at 3*d.* per lb., the usual rate for merchandise imported or exported by aliens (*Min. Acc.* 1221–10).

[8] From England and Spain.

(2) Commodities that were not produced at home, viz. salt,[1] wine,[2] oil,[3] pitch,[3] rosin. French goods (including combs, looking-glasses, and other toilet requisites),[4] together with Spanish fruits and Eastern spices.[5]

(3) Commodities required for admistrative purposes,[5] *i. e.* to supply the wants of the castle and the requirements of the local chanceries and exchequers.

In connection with the last of these divisions it should be noted that the castle was an important item in the medieval trade of Wales. Here artillery was received from Spain, and sulphur and saltpetre from London.[6] The pantry was supplied with salt and honey, and the buttery with wine, from Spain and France. The larder was filled with beef, mutton, and pork from the local stock, supplemented by red herring from Ireland. Corn and peas for the granary were imported from Dublin and Bristol.[7]

The victualling of the castle furnished the chief occupation of many a Welsh merchant,[8] and was often the motive for the maintenance of local quays.[9] English burgesses in Wales, when seeking the grant of a coveted privilege, usually emphasise and sometimes exaggerate the part they played in provisioning the castle garrison. English sovereigns almost invariably lend a favourable ear to such requests. The castle was the safeguard of the country from foreign invasion, and equally served to hold it in subjection.[10] The

[1] Gascony, Poitou, St. Gérand en Brittany, St. Gremery de Lile de Bas Pays, Portugal.

[2] Gascony, Rochelle, Romney, Brittany, Spain, Portugal. Cf. *Gweithian Iolo Goch* (Cymmrodorion Soc., ed. Charles Ashton), p. 37, where most of these places are referred to in a poem by the contemporary bard Lewis Glyn Cothi.

[3] Portugal.

[4] See *Customs Acc.* (Carnarvon) No. 4.

[5] *Min. Acc.* 21–22 H. VIII. (North Wales) No. 156.

[6] *Min. Acc.* 1305–17; *ib.* 7 H. VII. No. 1592.

[7] Exchequer Q. R. Acc. 232–21, 233–4.

[8] *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1292–1301), p. 138; *ib.* (1313–17), p. 439.

[9] E.g. *Cal. Close Rolls* (1318–22), pp. 449, 661.

[10] The unsettled state of Wales during this period is occasionally referred to in the Patent and Close Rolls. In 1337–8 Wales was feared to have been an accomplice of the Scottish rebels, dangers arising from their invasion in this direction, the Isle of Anglesea being a suitable vantage-ground (*Cal. Close*

author of 'The Libell of English Policye' in 1436 lays stress on the safe-keeping of Wales:

> Beware of Wales, Christ Jhesus mutte it keep
> That it make not our childes child to wepe
> . . . . . sith that many a day
> Men have ben ferde of her rebellioun.

The trading activity of the Welsh ports had much to do with this safeguarding of Wales, importing the necessaries for the castle garrison as well as the requisites of the local chanceries and exchequers. The latter, *inter alia*, included parchment,[1] paper,[1] register books,[1] canvas, cord, and candles,[2] together with iron-bound coffers for the custody of records.

Knowing the general character of the export and import trade during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, let us consider the chief agents engaged in the trade.

The merchants of Chester and Bristol practically enjoyed a monopoly of Welsh trade before the thirteenth century. But the rise of towns during the twelth and thirteenth centuries gave a new impulse to native merchants. The local ports were improved, the local shipping was developed, and the foreign trader was attracted.

Fixed customs were collected and prisage of wine was taken in the chief Welsh ports during the late thirteenth and following centuries.[3] Customs officials were appointed, butlers appearing in the more important ports, and gaugers of wine allotted to the districts of North and South Wales.[4]

Rolls (1337–9), pp. 136, 542–3). Further trouble arose from what is termed 'the lightness of head of the Welsh' or their tendency to rebel; they were suspected of rebellion in 1343 (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, (1343–45), pp. 66–7), and their condition was inquired into in 1381 (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, (1381–5), p. 17). Reasonable costs for resisting the Welsh rebels were allowed in 1423 (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, (1422–9), p. 51), and the 'riots of Wales' was a matter for the Privy Council in 1442 (*Acts of the Privy Council, a.c.* p. 211).

[1] London, Bristol, Coventry, and occasionally from merchants at the local fairs.

[2] Paris.

[3] See p. 151 above; *Cal. Close Rolls* (1279–1288), p. 101.

[4] The office of gauger of wines throughout the whole of Wales was committed to Bernard Pee de Fer in 1308 (*Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1307–1313), p. 71). Deputy

The Chester and Bristol merchants continued to take a prominent part in the trade with France, Spain, and Portugal in salt, wine, and iron.[1] Moreover, alien ships frequently visited the Welsh ports during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.[2] This gave a new turn to the activity of the Welsh merchants. Foreign products now entered freely into their articles of exchange. The South-Welsh merchants of Haverford, Milford, Tenby, and Carmarthen carried on an active trade in wine, salt, iron, and other foreign merchandise with Bristol and Ireland. Beaumaris and Carnarvon were the favourite ports of call in the North, the former becoming noted later as a dépôt for the exchange of Manchester cottons and Irish cloths.[3]

Native shipping was mostly confined to the small trade with Ireland, and to the coasting trade between the several Welsh ports and the centres of supply, Bristol and Chester. Boats of the South-Welsh ports often occur in the custom accounts of Bristol during the fifteenth century in connection with the trade between that town and Ireland.[4]

Some Welsh ships transported products from foreign countries in the late thirteenth century. Instances of this

butlers were appointed in North and South Wales (*ib.* p. 146; (1313–1317), p. 553).

[1] A Bristol ship brought wine to Beaumaris in 1380, and a ship from the same place as well as a ship of Fowey left wine at the port of Pwllheli in the same year (*Min. Acc.* 1305–8). Cf. *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1377–1381), p. 323. Chester ships called periodically in the parts of North Wales (e.g. *Min. Acc.* 1215–10); they seldom called at the South-Welsh ports. We, however, find a Chester ship at Milford in 1389 (*Min. Acc.* 1226–11).

[2] Alien ships appear in the South-Welsh ports early in the fourteenth century. (*Customs Acc.*, Bristol and Carmarthen, 15–1). Ships from Bayonne bring wine to Milford in 1389 and 1404 (*Min. Acc.* 1226–11–12), as do Spanish and Breton ships to Carmarthen in 1416 (*Min. Acc.* 1222–14). Towards the close of the fifteenth century alien ships increase, and appear commonly in the ports of North Wales (Chamberlain Acc. of North and South Wales *temp.* Hen. VII. *passim*).

[3] *Min. Acc.* 12–13 H. VIII. No. 120 (N. Wales); 30–31 H. VIII. No. 239; 32–33 H. VIII. No. 128.

[4] More particularly those of Chepstow, Tenby, Milford, and Carmarthen. Herrings, hake, salmon, salted fish, hides, Irish cloths, &c. were conveyed to Bristol, salt, iron, wine, English cloths, and other merchandise making up the return cargo to Ireland; e.g. *Customs Acc.*, Bristol, 17–6, 19–14; *Bristol Town Duties* (H. Bush), pp. 17–18, 21–22, 24.

become commoner in the following centuries, particularly in the cases of Milford and Haverford.[1] New encouragement was given to this policy by the Tudor system, when wine, among other things, was obliged to be imported in Welsh ships.[2]

The means of communication by which exports and imports were readjusted so as to satisfy local needs is an interesting subject. With the mention of the fact that packhorses were commonly employed on the land routes,[3] and that ready use was made of the local ferries and of all river transport possible,[4] we may treat of it here in a general manner.

Bristol and Chester were the principal centres of exchange, each Welsh district having its local divisions and principal centre of supply. South Wales, made up of several lordships, had its local centres of supply. Gwent had its Chepstow, Glamorgan its Cardiff, and Gower its Swansea. West Wales was well served by Haverford and Carmarthen. Mid-Wales and the bordering Marcher districts had their principal Marcher towns, Hereford on the Wye, and Shrewsbury on the Severn. Beaumaris, Carnarvon, and Conway, with other minor ports of call, supplied the Principality of North Wales, as did Chester and Rhuddlan the old district of the Four Cantreds.

Two circumstances which often thwarted the successful development of this external trade were (1) the piracy of the Western sea,[5] and (2) the lawlessness of the Marches.

[1] *Patent Rolls*, *s.a.* 1295, 1308 (Conway), 1304, 1315 (Haverford), 1314 (Chepstow). Ships from the following Welsh towns among others left Bristol for foreign parts at the dates mentioned: 1392, 1399 (Caerleon), 1381 (Chepstow), 1378 (Carmarthen), 1399 (Milford), 1481 (Tenby). *Customs Acc.*, Bristol, *s.a.c.*

[2] *Rot. Parl.* vi. 331.

[3] Fifty packhorses were employed to carry 25 qrs. of oats from diverse places in Anglesea to the Menai, whence it was conveyed in two boats to the port of Carnarvon, Exchequer Q. R. Acc. 4–2. Three packhorses were hired to convey 550*l.* from Carmarthen to London. The journey to and fro occupied eighteen days, the cost of transit amounting to about 8*d.* in the pound (*Min. Acc.* 1218–6).

[4] *Cf.* pp. 140–141, above.

[5] A ship called 'La James of Carnarvon' was plundered at Holyhead by the rebels of Scotland in 1315 (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, (1313–17), p. 421). Somewhat later a ship of Haverford was taken in the high seas between Lampadarn and Cardigan

Attempts were made to improve the conditions of trade. An Admiralty Office was established at Beaumaris[1] to ward off the pirates of the Irish Sea, and the Court of the President of the Marches was instituted to deal with the lawless inhabitants of the Marches.

The establishment of a court such as this was a long-felt want, as a perusal of the Parliament Rolls for the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries will evince. From the complaints made therein by burgesses of the Marcher towns, it will be found that the lawlessness of the Marches was due to one or more of the following causes:—(1) Border raids by the Welsh, who were often said to have had secret accomplices among the Welsh inhabitants of the Marcher towns themselves.[2] (2) Arrest of merchants going to Wales with their goods and merchandise, often resulting in their unjust detention on the Welsh mountains or in the castle of a Marcher lord.[3] (3) Indiscriminate distressing between country and country. This—the unjust distraint of Englishmen, when going into Wales, for debt or default for which they were in no manner responsible—was a very common complaint.[4] To the Welshman, it was a man from the Marches that owed him money: he was not particularly scrupulous as to getting the actual person, so long as he had one bearing that general description. As a counterpart to this we find Richard II. granting like freedom to the men of Hereford in 1394. The charter granted to the mayor and citizens at this date made it lawful for them hereafter, when such arrests were made and no deliverance followed, to arrest in like manner any

by the 'enemies of Scotland.' In 1377 Rees ap Griffith, Kt., was appointed to keep the coasts of Milford and other coasts of South Wales against hostile invasion (*Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1377–81), p. 15).

[1] *Min. Acc.* 7–8 H. VIII. No. 21.

[2] *Rot. Parl.* ii. p. 352 (1376); iii. 81 (1376); iii. 81 (1380); iv. 52 (1414); vi. 160 (1473).

[3] *Ib.* iii. 272 (1389), 474 (1401). For a notable instance of this see *Cal. Close Rolls* (1330–34), pp. 571–2: arrest of the burgesses of Shrewsbury, on their way to a fair at Welshpool, by the men of Richard, Earl of Arundel, and their confinement to Oswestry Castle. Cf. *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1385–89), p. 19.

[4] *Rot. Parl.* ii. 259, 358; iii. 45 (1378), 272 (1389), 474 (1401).

persons belonging to the lordship of Wales within the city and the liberties, until satisfaction be made for the losses sustained.[1]

Trading activity in the Marches by persons in districts beyond the limits of their local lordship was insecure and unsafe; even within the lordship it was at best precarious. Local trading lacked the security of a county jurisdiction. Following the committal of thefts, murders, &c., in this lordship came the hasty withdrawal of the perpetrators into the next, where they remained unmolested. It was with the object of allaying this continual unrest that Edward IV. instituted the Court of the President of the Marches. This court exercised strong powers in putting down the lawlessness of the March, and from the fact that its jurisdiction was concurrent with many of the adjoining counties, a thief, that before escaped scot-free, was often doubly punished, thus giving rise to a new form of complaint. So effective was the work of the court under the presidency of Roland Lee that all the thieves in Wales were said to quake for fear. There can be no doubt but that the court did much to promote trading security between Wales and the border counties,[2] and the holding of the court itself, causing the meeting of a large concourse of people, gave an impulse to trade. When courts were being held at Hereford, Welshmen were allowed, during two days in every week that the court sat, to bring their merchandise to the town.[3]

The character of the Welsh export and import trade is much the same during the early part of the sixteenth century. The changes that occur appear in the improvement of the conditions of trade.

We have seen how the Principality of Wales partook of the larger insularity of Britain in 1284 through the medium of the shire system. The fourteenth and fifteenth centuries

[1] *Hereford MSS.* (Rep. of Hist. MSS. Com.), p. 287.

[2] *Influence and Development of English Gilds* (F. A. Hibbert), pp. 3, 79; Owen and Blakeway's *Hist. of Shrewsbury*, i. 231.

[3] *Hereford MSS.*, as above, p. 337.

were the period of transition in the story of the Marches. The local insularity of the lordship disappeared with the gradual increase in the power of the Crown. Several of the lordships came into the hands of the Crown by forfeiture and other means. These were usually termed the 'Counties of the Marches of Wales,' being under the control of royal bailiffs. The Act of Union in 1536 consummated this process. The 'land of Wales' became part of the English realm, and the people of Wales, irrespective of racial distinction, became subjects of the English king.

National commerce seems to demand the following among other conditions of success: namely, equality of privilege and a common judicature. These were the weak links in the trade of medieval Wales. The towns offered no equality of privilege, a fact which often proved detrimental to internal trade; and the chief evil of the Marches lay in the multiplicity of its jurisdictions—there was in reality no central judicature.

The Act of Union supplied these wants. It placed the inhabitants of Wales on an equality with the subjects of the English realm, and made the disaffected province of Wales a member of the realm of England.

ITALIAN BANKERS AND THE ENGLISH CROWN

By ROBERT JOWITT WHITWELL, F.R.Hist.S.

Read March 19, 1903

I

TO THE FALL OF THE *SOCIETAS RICARDORUM* OF LUCCA[1]

THE geographical position of Britain made her dependent upon the Mediterranean races—with their higher civilisation and more advanced mechanical processes—for the development of the natural resources of the island.

Her distance from the central marts of the world was counterbalanced in the dawn of her history by the excellence and cheapness of her tin and hides ; and in the eleventh and later centuries by the primacy of her wools in all the textile work of Europe.

The Mediterranean, and especially the Italian, artisan was supplied with the raw material of his labour. The English landed proprietor obtained from the Italian merchant the spices and drugs of the East as well as large money payments for his wool. Kings and great men obtained silks and fine cloths for the Court, and vestments for the churches and monasteries they built, from the looms of Italy and Bagdad. This commerce was at first carried on through Flemish or French intermediaries ; but early in the thirteenth century the Italian merchant came to carry on his trade in person.

The ruling classes had habituated themselves to these

[1] See note on p. 217.

advantages, and felt that they had everything to gain and nothing to lose from a continuance of this international exchange. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the Great Charter[1] forbids the seizure or confiscation, in case of war, of the goods of merchant strangers, save when reprisals were being made in the enemy's country. 'Il est beau,' says Montesquieu,[2] 'que la nation anglaise ait fait de cela un des articles de sa liberté;' and while the Englishman accepts the compliment to his forefathers, he is conscious that without the foreign merchant and his commerce the economic history of this island would have been utterly different, and its growth in wealth and civilisation have been immensely retarded.

At the end of the fourteenth century, John Gower, in his *Mirour de l'omme* (25387–92), apostrophises the lady Wool:

> Tu n'es jammes sanz bons amys,
> Q'en ton service se sont mys
> Pour le proufit de ton affere:
> Tu es par tout le mond cheris,
> La terre dont tu es norris
> Par toy puet grande chose fere.

And this was equally true from the twelfth century (when we first find documentary evidence of the organised collection of wools throughout the country and their subsequent export) down to the time when English kings at last practically succeeded in their project of stopping such export in order that the wool might be woven within their realm.

During this whole period, the merchants of Lucca or Florence—better known, in formal documents as well as in common speech, as 'Lombards'—had a great share in the wool trade and derived great wealth from it, much to the indignation of 'true-born Englishmen'—for whom let John Gower speak again:[3]

> L'en porra trop esmerveiller
> En nostre terre a mon avis

[1] Sect. 41 of Stubbs's edition in *Sel. Charters*, v. (1895) 301.

[2] *De l'Esprit des Lois*, xx. xiv.

[3] *Mirour de l'omme*, 25430–25440.

Des Lumbardz, qui sont estranger,
Q'est ce q'ils vuillont chalanger
A demourer en noz paiis
Tout auci francs, auci cheris,
Comme s'ils fuissent neez et norriz
Ovesque nous : mais pour guiler
Moustront semblant come noz amis,
Et soubz cela lour cuer ont mys
De nostre argent et orr piler.

In the present paper I hope to discuss the relations to the English Crown of some of the Italian merchants who had originally come to the country for some such commerce as is indicated above,[1] and had accumulated great wealth, either in trade or by the lending of money, so that we should describe them to-day as bankers (or, perhaps, financiers) rather than by the simpler term of 'merchants,' which is invariably used of them in contemporary documents.

The aspects of their activity here dealt with are the economic and the juridical. Italian merchants did not in England take that share in politics that was taken by their fellow countrymen—sometimes even by partners in their firms—in other parts of Europe, and notably in France.

The closing quarter of the thirteenth century saw the rise in England of the Florentine Frescobaldi, whose personal influence and financial ascendency led to the political changes of the early years of Edward II.[2]

[1] That some originally came to England as collectors of papal taxes (see Matthew Paris, cited below, p. 196) is undoubted; but the recently published *Calendars of Patent and Close Rolls* and other available documents warrant us in saying that the more important and influential firms were intrusted with the papal finance *after* they had established their trade in the country. Professor Cunningham (*Growth of Engl. Indust. and Comm.: Early and Middle Ages* (1900) II. iv. § 69, 186) shows, by his choice of words, that he expected to find evidence in this direction as new documents were published.

So serious a book as L. Goldschmidt's *Handbuch des Handelsrechts* (1891, I. I. III. v. § 7, 186) finds the origin of commercial intercourse between England and Italy in the semi-mythical *stammvater* of the Irish Geraldines: 'Bereit Ende des 11. Jahrhs. ist ein reicher Florentiner ansässig: Otto degli Gherardini.' I need hardly say that this note does not allude to the Frenchman named.

[2] The magnitude of their financial operations, and their entire control of the revenues of the kingdom, have been related in a paper by Mr. Charles Johnson,

Baroncino Gualteri, of the great firm of the Ricciardi of Lucca, was an intimate of many of the ruling men, and his grandson was in close relation with Edward of Carnarvon himself, but the firm never seem to have engaged in politics at home or abroad save in certain financial transactions with the Curia on behalf of Edward I.

Though their business extended over much of the Continent, and they collected papal revenues from many quarters, they never interfered in English politics as the Frescobaldi did, nor in international politics as did some other firms of Florence and Siena more closely involved in the struggles for the ruling of Sicily and Apulia.

By way of contrast to the tamer subject-matter of my paper, let me translate a few words from an anonymous memoir on the events of 1297 [1] in which the writer describes the negotiations against England of Philip le Bel carried on by Musciatto and Albizzo Franzesi, commonly known as 'Mouche' and 'Biche:'

'Our lord the king sent to the king of Germany, who was already his ally, and to other neighbouring rulers, his envoys, the bishop of Bélehem and the prior of the friars preacher of Paris, who had small audience because they went without proper funds; but after them went Monseigneur Mouche, who went so well supplied with money and so well furnished that he had good audience, and succeeded in inducing the king's brother to come to Lille in Flanders, where Monseigneur Mouche went to him, and concluded the treaty of which he had settled the preliminaries with him in Germany.

'Likewise Monseigneur Mouche went straight to the Duke of Brabant, who was of his livery and like a creature of his (*qui estoit de ses robes et si come sa criature*) and did so

of the P.R.O. (printed in the *Transactions* of the St. Albans and Hertfordshire Architectural and Archæological Society, i. (1903) 320–334), where interesting particulars are added as to the negotiations with the pope for the capture of certain members of the firm who had fled from England.

[1] *Archives Nat.*, Trésor des Chartes J. 654, No. xvi. in *Notices et extraits* xx. (1862) II. 126.

much for the help of Godfrey, the duke's brother, and of others, that though the English marriage was carried through, the duke promised that he would not be against the king nor take action against him—which latter promise he kept.'[1]

The investigation, of which some results are given in this paper, cannot be absolutely conclusive owing to the breaks in the series of financial rolls and to the fact that we still await the completion of the official edition of the Patent Rolls of Henry III. and of the calendar of the Close Rolls of Edward I.[2]

The acceptance by Henry III. for his son Edmund of the ill-fated crown of Sicily and Apulia involved him in the payment of vast sums. The popes carried on the campaign against Conradin in their own way,—raised the necessary funds by usurious contracts with merchants of Siena and others,—and transferred the liabilities to Henry. He was not able to meet these liabilities,[3] and had resort to various expedients for shifting the burden to other shoulders. Of these the most notorious was the *nimis damnosa proditio*[4] devised by Peter of Aigueblanche, the Savoyard bishop of Hereford, formerly secretary to William of Valence.[5] *Discerptus et dissecatus*, Henry had instructed that

[1] An apt illustration of the complete control by certain Italian merchants of French revenues will be found in a letter dated at Rocheamadour, May 7, 1289, transcribed in *Liber B.*, fol. 36, from Ralph de Breuellio, knight, seneschal for the French king of the Périgordais and Caorsin, authorising Edward I. or his representatives at Bordeaux to pay certain sums to 'Bacus boni Amici and Armand Orlandi of Florence, receivers of the king's money in his *sénéchaussée*.' The latter will give a receipt under 'the seal *which we use* in our said sénéchaussée, whereupon is the following inscription: "S. fresquembaudor' & francescor' & landuch.;" and in the centre is a certain lily flower, and certain letters s. C. by the flower.'

[2] A statement of the present position of these publications and a brief notice of some of the financial rolls, combined with some proofs that support the statement as to interest, will be found in Appendix A.

[3] They amounted in April 1255 to over 90,000*l*. (Rymer's *Fœdera*, i. 316.)

[4] Matthew Paris, *Chron. Maj.* (Rolls) v. 510–3, 557–9. See also the *litteræ papales miserabiles* of June 1256 (*ibid.* 581–4) and the *Additamenta*, vi. 307–11.

[5] 'Whose memory exhales a sulphurous and most foul stench,' M. Paris, *ubi supra*, 510. Possibly the fact that St. Albans Abbey was bound under this

astute prelate to raise money for Thomas of Savoy, who was fighting against Turin and Asti, and for the other calls on the royal purse,—of which the papal claim was the most considerable. And the bishop's promise, 'Te faciam usque ad summam abundantiam thesauris redundare,' was welcomed by the king; as was his announcement to Alexander IV., 'sad and in confusion for the recent adversities of the Church' and 'debitis innodatus,' that 'before we left England the lord king, I, and this most skilful knight provided a safe way and certain manner for the payment of the whole without difficulty.' I need not here repeat the details of this scheme, which Matthew Paris has described with inimitable vivacity and sarcasm, nor reproduce his words of admiration for the priors and convents of Durham and Guisborough, who refused 'to consent to so virulent an obligation, and subject their churches to such unmeasured servitude, even though nearly all the rest were bowing the knee to Baal.'[1]

The sums dealt with in these guileful transactions were reported to Matthew as amounting to 250,000*l.*; and a nameless annotator had added to his manuscript a note that 'eight thousand marks were assessed to be collected from the single diocese of Lincoln.'[2] Without following Sir James Ramsay's advice to divide all round numbers by ten, I may point out that these two figures are entirely inconsistent with each other, the ecclesiastical goods in the diocese of Lincoln being certainly worth more than $2\frac{2}{15}$ per cent. of the whole of such goods in the country, and that half or even a quarter of the sum in question would supply a considerable deficiency in the coffers of king and pope. By the following February 20,000*l.* had been paid to 'merchants who have the monasteries pledged;'[3] and some of their liabilities at any rate then remained undischarged.[4] Without an exhaustive examination of the 'Foreign Accounts' on the Pipe Rolls

scheme for 500 marks (*Gesta Abbatum Monast. S. Albani* (Rolls), i. 382–3) accounts for Matthew's adjectives.

[1] *Chron Maj.* v. 584.

[2] *Ibid.* 533.

[3] Rymer's *Fœdera*, i. 337.

[4] Cf. the date of the document in M. Paris, *Chron. Maj.* (Rolls) vi. 350.

(which I have not been able to undertake) it is impossible to say what the total royal revenue from England was at this time.

Receipt Rolls are missing from Michaelmas term 1254–5 to Easter term 1256. The revenues for several subsequent terms are set forth in the note,[1] and show an average of something over 14,000*l.* per annum paid in to the Great Receipt.

It is obvious that the savings (if any[2]) on this revenue would not be adequate to meet the '*interesse* and damages' on so large a sum as the balance still due to the merchants.

With regard to the whole of this Sicilian liability, it must be remembered that large parts of it must have been raised from the French possessions of the Crown, by various methods, probably analogous to those used in England, but as to which we have not details in English documents.

The financial straits of Henry III. were due in large part to his personal lavishness, but chiefly to his weakly undertaking foreign adventures at the solicitation of his astute foreign relatives and of still astuter popes. Had he been content to govern the realms to which he succeeded, the greater part of his troubles would never have arisen.

[1]

	£	s.	d.
Mich. 1256–7	7,553	9	3
Easter 1257	5,590	11	7½
Mich. 1257–8	8,540	4	7½
Easter 1258	4,978	5	6
Mich. 1258–9	8,591	10	5½
Easter 1259	7,429	18	6

[2] The *Issue Rolls* for the terms referred to in the previous note (so far as they remain to us) show the disbursements of the Great Receipt as follows:

	£.	s.	d.
Mich. 1256–7	5,257	19	7
Easter 1257	7,715	13	0
Mich. 1257–8	9,256	6	8½
Easter 1258	3,530	18	6½

This gives a *nominal* surplus of receipts over expenditure of about 900*l.* on the two years; but, in the absence of *Jornalia Rolls*, we have no evidence as to whether this sum was carried to the next year, or disposed of in some other way.

His son, also, was frequently in financial embarrassment; but this resulted not so much from his own choice and caprice as from the inevitable tendency of the times.

This tendency has been so well expressed by M. G. Yver[1] that I make no apology for adapting some of his phrases:

'The dynasty suffers, in short, from the same trouble and is passing through the same crisis as the great states of Western Europe. Like France, the kingdom is no longer a purely feudal monarchy. The sovereigns claim to exert an absolute and direct authority over the whole area of their territory; for this purpose they organise a complicated and costly administration. They desire to make their influence felt beyond their frontiers, and engage in a policy no longer exclusively French or English, but European. Feudal contingents are not sufficient for them, they are obliged to maintain stipendiary troops. But the revenues of the royal domain and feudal renders are too slender to meet the growth of expense resulting from this new conception of royalty.' The wars that involved king and kingdom in indebtedness to Italian financiers were not of Edward's seeking; and the French war was apparently a less strain on the finances of England than on those of France.

The ordinary revenue of the kingdom was growing rapidly. The receipts from the custom of wools and hides between May 23, 1275, and May 20, 1279, amounted to no less than 43,801*l.* 18*s.* 9*d.*[2] The 'New Custom' of wools and hides between Easter 1282 and Easter 1286 amounted to 36,071*l.* 13*s.* 1*d.*[3]

In the Great Receipt from Easter 1275 to Michaelmas 1278–9 (corresponding almost exactly to the first of these

[1] *Le Commerce et les Marchands dans l'Italie méridionale au XIII^e et au XIV^e Siècle* (Paris 1903), p. 264.

[2] 'Account of Luca [Natale] of Lucca, Orlandino di Poggio, and other their partners [Ricciardi of Lucca] of all their receipts and expenses, as well this side the sea as beyond, from November 20, 1272, to September 29, 1279.' *Accounts*, &c., Exch. K.R., Bundle 126, No. 1.

[3] 'Account of Riccardo Guidiccioni and his partners.' *Chancellor's Roll* 15 Edw. I. m. 3 d.

periods) the total receipts were 45,563*l.* 15*s.* 7*d.*[1] The earlier years of this second period cover the Welsh expedition of 1282–3; and the figures stated in the last note may be supplemented from the accounts of the Receipt of the Great Wardrobe:

	£	s.	d.
1281–2 (Nov. 20 to Nov. 20) . . .	25,222	6	0[2]
1282–3 ,, . . .	101,952	17	7[3]

In spite of the growth of the ordinary revenues of the Crown, and of the possible expedients of prests and of tenths and fifteenths, the sudden pressure of events often made a call upon the treasury which it was unable to meet.[4]

[1] For the second period we have, unfortunately, only Receipt Rolls for two years; the following comparison shows the income from each source:

Year.	Great Receipt. £	s.	d.	New Custom. £	s.	d.
1282–3 (Easter to Easter)	13,408	12	0	8,604	19	3
1285–6 ,,	25,527	12	6	8,904	13	6½

[2] *Account*, Exch. K.R., Bundle 351, No. 4. This includes a sum of 10,000*l.*, 'moneys lent by the merchants of Lucca to make up the expenses of the household,' which was charged on the customs.

[3] *Ibid.* No. 10. This includes loans from various persons and societies amounting to 30,466*l.* 17*s.* 3*d.* As to the contributions of Italians, &c., see Appendix A, p. 219.

[4] Some idea of the small amounts available for sudden expenditure may be deduced from the *Jornalia Rolls*, which show the amounts carried down from day to day and from one account to another. We have also a single Treasurer's Account of the reign of Edward I. (Exch. T.R. *Treasurer's Rolls*, No. 1) from which I note some of the sums carried down on the various dates on which a balance was struck:

		£	s.	d.
1284, January 14.	Receipts	29,885	12	4½
to 1285, September 29.	Payments	29,879	2	4½
	Balance down	6	10	0½ (*sic*)
1285, September 29.	Receipts	10,254	11	6½
to 1286, September 18.	Payments	10,142	9	10
	Balance down	112	1	8½
1286, September 19.	Receipts	23,230	19	9
to 1287, September 18.	Payments	22,758	19	7
	Balance down	472	0	2

On February 29, 1286, an account had been taken which showed a balance o. 2*l.* 8*s.* 1*d.* in the treasury. On subsequent balances (*e.g.* February 11, 1288) the expenditure proved exactly equal to the receipts, and the account closes on July 16, 1289, with the magnificent balance in hand of 2*l.* 13*s.* 8½*d.*

None of the last-named methods of raising money was of real service in a great emergency. The necessary delay between the order being given and the receipt of the proceeds (whether through the sheriffs or through special collectors) must in any case be reckoned by weeks, and in most cases by months.

The Italian merchant was even more readily available than the corporation of London in a time of stress. If not in actual attendance on the king,[1] he could easily be brought from his counting-house in London. And he came without demanding franchises and charters as the city fathers did ;[2] he had no theory that 'redress of grievances must precede supply.' *That* was the prerogative of Parliament.

He was able to provide large sums with a few days' delay,[3] either from his own partner's bank, or from those of his countrymen, and he was thus in a position to make what terms he would with the king or his treasurer. The astounding thing is that he treated the Crown so generously.

In return for his money he took the king's bond, and did not apparently charge him any interest on his advance.[4] In spite of the well-known danger of arguing the non-existence of anything from the mere absence of evidence of its exist-

[1] We find Baroncino Galteri with Edward I. in the Welsh expeditions of 1282–3 ; on April 14, 1282, at Devizes ; on May 16 at Worcester, on July 9 at Rhuddlan ; and at the same place on June 20, 1283. (*Rot. Walliæ* 10 Edw. I. memb. 9 and 5 ; 11 Edw. I. m. 1.)

[2] Cf. *Pat. Roll* 27 Edward I. m. 27, May 6, 1299.

[3] A quite exceptional 'tightness' of money is exemplified by entries in the *Receipt Roll* (Pells) No. 102, under dates 18, 19, and 21 October, which show that the four sums of 500*m.* stated in *Misc. Roll* (Chanc.) Bundle 16, No. 13, to have been received on October 19, 1295 (see *post*, p. 219), were as a matter of fact paid into the Great Receipt in eight instalments (varying between 100*m.* and 400*m.*) spread over four days. Usually, much larger sums were promptly paid in.

[4] A contrast is afforded by the price which the Emperor Frederick II. had to pay for funds to carry on his Italian campaign of 1239. On October 14 (to take one instance out of many) in the camp of Milan Frederick borrowed 16*l.* 8*s.* 5*d.* or *grossi Veneziani* from Gualterio de' Cesalini and Pietro Giurda, merchants of Rome. In the event of non-payment the emperor's secretary is bound to pay the lenders 'pro dampnis in interesse sicut eveniet, ad rationem de tribus unciis dandis per mensem de unciis centum.' (*Regesta*, 12 b, in Huillard-Bréholles, *Hist. diplom. Frid. II.* V. 1. 446–7.)

ence, it seems possible to say with regard at any rate to loans from Italian merchants,[1] as earlier workers have already stated in more general terms :[2]

1. That no interest or other payment for the use of money was stipulated for or paid in the time of King John, save in the few instances of gratuities recorded below.

2. That, whatever may have been the case as to Henry III.'s borrowings in Italy made at the pope's request for the Sicilian expedition, he did not, as a rule,[3] pay interest on advances made to him by Italian merchants.

3. That Edward I. did not promise[4] or pay[5] any premiums or interest to such merchants ; but that he gave to some of them gratuities in recognition of what canonists call *damna*

[1] The true Caorsin was not so generous. We have the facts stated in Appendix A (p. 220) ; and the further fact that in the financial distress of 1255, apparently before Peter of Aigueblanche had mooted his plan of raising funds, Henry III. made 'representations by Simon Passelewe to the houses of Westminster, St. Albans, Reading, and Waltham, that he proposed to raise money from merchants of Cahors, upon the joint and several bones of the four houses for 2,000 marks and 500 marks usury' (*Gesta Abbatum Monast. S. Albani* (Rolls), i. 379.) As loans were almost invariably repayable at twelve months' date, we are justified in concluding that the rate of interest in this case was 25 per cent. per annum.

[2] Bond (*Archæologia*, xxviii. 228) says : 'Interest was very rarely promised for loans which the king received of the Italians. An exact equivalent seems to have been returned for the amount borrowed, and the usual remuneration was a premium, sometimes conditioned for at the time, but apparently more often voluntarily conferred, in consideration of losses and expenses occasioned by a delay in repayment.' See Rhodes, *ubi infra*, p. 140.

[3] I believe the whole of these exceptions, for the period for which evidence is available, are dealt with below.

[4] There is one exception only of which I am aware. This was in the case of a loan *negotiated in Italy* when Edward was at Orvieto on his return from the Holy Land, and on February 18, 1273, borrowed from the Scotti of Piacenza 8,000*l. tournois*. He agreed to pay to them or to the bearer of his bond 3,000 marks (the normal equivalent) at the New Temple at or before Midsummer, and, in case of non-payment, 'to restore and make good all damages, expenses, and *interesse* that the merchants or any of them should incur or sustain for recovering such money with the principal debt.' (*Diplom. Doc.* Exch. T. R. Box 1, No. 13). That Edward actually paid nothing in respect of 'damages' in this case is rendered almost certain by the fact that a sum of 1,000 marks borrowed at the same time from a Florentine firm was repaid without any addition in 1275. *Pat. Roll* 3 Edw. I. m. 17.

[5] Unless in two cases during the Welsh war of 1282–3. See App. A, p. 220.

emergentia—actual losses and injury to their business through their money being employed in his service. Such payments show no definite ratio to the amount of debt for the time being outstanding.

The merchant doubtless expected to recoup himself, and did to a very large extent do so, not so much from capricious money gifts, as from the benefits derivable to himself and his firm and family from the royal patronage (exerted abroad [1] as well as in England [2]), from the farming of various branches of the revenue, and from the facilities granted to him for carrying on securely his chief businesses of buying wools from, and lending money to, the lieges, as will be mentioned later.

Even for the periods for which full materials are available, I have not tried to ascertain the amounts that changed hands in the course of the 120 years with which I deal. For such an attempt, and for many other particulars, I must refer to the work of my precursors in this study,[3] and especially to that of Mr. Rhodes.

[1] For an example, see the commendation to the pope of Giovanni and Filippo de' Frescobaldi on *Roman Roll* 4 Edw. II. m. 24.

[2] See writ to chancellor of December 3, 1310, on *Pat. Roll* 4 Edw. II., part II., m. 7.

[3] The late Sir Edward A. Bond in 1839 communicated to the Society of Antiquaries (*Archæologia*, xxviii. 207–326) a series of 'Extracts from the *Liberate* Rolls relative to Loans supplied by Italian Merchants to the Kings of England in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries; with an introductory Memoir.' In this pioneer work, Bond printed writs of *liberate* only from what are known as 'Early Chancery Rolls.' In verifying some of his copying—which is not entirely reliable—I have discovered many omissions, and the further fact that he did not refer to the *Liberate* or Receipt Rolls of the Exchequer or Receipt even for those years in which the Chancery Rolls are missing. In addition, he copied the whole of the roll now quoted as 'Miscellaneous Roll (Chancery), Bundle 16, No. 13,' relating to the 'Great Prest' of 1294–9.

Since I entered on the work, Mr. W. E. Rhodes has published in the volume of *Historical Essays by Members of the Owens College, Manchester*, London, 1902, pp. 137–167, a paper on 'The Italian Bankers in England and their Loans to Edward I. and Edward II.' This essay relies mainly on Bond's work and on the printed Calendars of Patent and Close Rolls. Each author shows very large sums borrowed from or paid to Italian bankers, amounting in the case of the Frescobaldi Bianchi to 121,941*l.* 2*s.* 11½*d.* in the course of twenty-

The first record of a connexion of Italian bankers with the English Crown is of the most circumstantial character, and relates to the *re giovane* of Dante's 'Inferno' (xxviii. 135), Henry the son of Henry II. of England, of whom Giraldus Cambrensis speaks in a language of ecstatic admiration,[1] which appears to express no more than the universal popular opinion of this meteoric son of a passionate father. His death, on June 11, 1183, has been described to us in one of the few passages in which Giraldus speaks with deep feeling. Benvenuto da Imola[2] possibly accounts for his popularity by telling us that the 'young king granted every petition to overflowing.' 'But no revenue,' he adds, 'sufficed for his bounty; nay, he was continually borrowing from others, and was always indebted to many.' After his mortal wound, his friends asked him how he would dispose of his possessions. 'What have I to dispose of,' said he, 'since I possess nothing?' 'Then a certain agent (*factor*) of a certain society in Florence, to wit of the Bardi, who had lent him a very great sum, amounting to a hundred thousand *aurei*, said tearfully, 'And I, good lord, what shall I do?' Then the young king sighed and said, 'Thou alone compellest me to make a will.' And straightway he called a notary, and duly made a will, and among other things he made a strange bequest (*mirabile legatum*), saying, 'I leave my soul to the devil unless my father shall fully pay all my debts.'[3]

one years, and a total of such borrowings for the reigns of the first two Edwards of some 420,000*l.*

Mr. Rhodes has much facilitated the work of others by the full reference which he has given for every transaction noted by him, and especially by his information as to what members of each firm were for the time being active in its English counting-house.

[1] 'Filius [sc. Henricus juvenis] plus homine dilectus extiterat, pater vero cunctis infestus et exosus' (*De Princ. Instruct.* II. viii. *Wks.* (Rolls) viii. 173); and in the following chapter 'tanquam alter Priameius Hector, suis honor, hostibus horror, omnibus amor.'

[2] *Benvenuti de Rambaldis de Imola Comentum super Dantis Comœdiam* (1887), ii. 377.

[3] Canon Edward Moore, whom I asked whether any other early commentator on Dante speaks of this loan, stigmatises this touching and circumstantial narrative as a 'cock-and-bull story,' and says that it had no support elsewhere. I am

When we leave this region of romance and come down to authenticated documents, we find, naturally enough, that the first transactions of which we have mention in which an Englishman, king or commoner, became indebted to Italians for money lent[1] took place in the centre of the Christian world;[2] and the earliest of those recorded in English rolls are connected with the securing of the satisfaction of loans made in the court of Rome to envoys of the English crown 'ad negotia nostra ibidem expedienda.'[3] It is only in connexion with these loans that I have been able to trace certainly the payment of any sums by way of interest; and as the point is of much importance, it is necessary to go somewhat minutely into the course of procedure. The usual practice was for the envoys to be paid in cash an adequate sum of money for their expenses in the journey to Rome[4] and to be intrusted with one or more letters of credit, nearly always addressed to merchants in general,[5] authorising

not disposed to quarrel with the epithet; but it seems quite likely that loans were made by Italians to Henry, though all but impossible that the Bardi could have been concerned in them.

[1] The scope of this paper does not extend to the payments made to Italian shipowners and merchants for the transport and victualling of English contingents to the crusades. I have searched in vain for information on such payments in the Archives of Pisa, and I am not aware of any at Genoa, the two places where it seemed most likely to be found. If the documents could be recovered, their study would give us results of the greatest value.

[2] Notes as to some of such transactions with English ecclesiastics, prior in date to transactions with English sovereigns, will be found in Appendix B. The historian, Peter of Blois, figures in connexion with the earliest of which I can produce exact details.

[3] Bond has printed in *Archæologia*, xxviii. (216–7 = *Charter Roll* 1 John, 21 d) the bond of August 25, 1199, mentioned in Appendix B, note 1.

[4] They were sometimes provided also with facilities in negotiation. The account of William Marshall, senior, of the issues of the Wardrobe (*Foreign Roll*, No. 1, m. 4: 1224–7) includes an entry: 'Et v. cardinalibus v. smaragdos de dono per Philippum de Hadham per breve regis.' See App. C, Nos. 27, 29.

[5] One of the very few instances of such a letter addressed to an individual firm is a writ of July 5, 1242, to Chiaro Ugolini of Florence and his partners: 'Mandamus vobis rogantes quatenus abbati de Alta Cumba [Hautecombe, Savoy] ac magistro Bernardo de Romanuz, quos pro negociis nostris ad Curiam Romanam destinamus, vel eorum alteri, mutuum mille marcarum detis,'—the king promising to repay the same (*Rôles Gascons*, No. 1057). Chiaro had had considerable sums belonging to Henry in his possession very shortly before.

them to borrow fixed sums of money on the king's behalf, he undertaking the payment as principal debtor.[1] By a letter of credit of November 28, 1200 ('Rot. Lit. Chart.' 99) John bound himself as principal debtor to whosoever would lend his envoys to the Curia 500 marks, on production of that letter, of a receipt signed by the envoys or two of them, and of 'letters testimonial of the lord pope or two or more (*aliquorum*) cardinals.' At the same time he ordered other letters in the same form for 500 marks, and six pairs of letters for 250 marks each, a total amount of 2,500 marks. The notes on the roll show that only one letter for 500 marks was used, the others being returned to the king at various times. The entry is valuable as showing that at an early date the concurrence of officials of the Curia was necessary to validate loans to kings as well as those to ecclesiastics.

The available material does not justify us in deciding whether these letters were discounted to any extent by the merchants with whom they were negotiated, or whether the bearers received the full face value. The credit of the English Crown on the Roman market obviously varied from time to time, and it seems reasonable to suppose that the cost of the envoy to be sent to the Exchequer at Westminster and of the retransmission of the money[2] would in

A rare, and possibly unique, instance of an unlimited credit will be found in the letter of Edward I., dated at Laverdans, May 8, 1289, in which the king informs 'his friends, Labrus Vulpelli and partners, dwelling in Rome,' that he is sending to the Curia his secretary Otho de Grandison, knight, and begs them 'to supply liberally and securely such loan to Otho as he shall consider the business requires,' promising to answer for such sum. (*Rôles Gascons*, II. No. 1488.) It was doubtless in recompense for this loan that Edward granted (November 4, 1290: *Pat. Roll* 18 Edw. I. m. 2) 5,000 marks to the Ricciardi 'for their services at the Court of Rome.'

[1] E.g. *Rot. Pat.* (1835) 4 b, 5, 9, 10, &c. See *Archæologia*, xxviii. 217.

[2] M. G. Yver (*Le Commerce et les Marchands dans l'Italie méridionale au XIII^e et au XIV^e Siècle*, Paris, 1903) has collected a number of instances of charges for the transmission of money from Naples in the first quarter of the fourteenth century. In 1309 the rate to Genoa was 4 per cent., to Avignon 8 per cent., to Rome 12 per cent., and to Paris 13 per cent. In the first of these cases at any rate, and probably in others, the money was transmitted by a document of credit and not in specie. We may assume that the rate between Rome and London could not be less than 5 per cent.

the first place be deducted, and that no reliance would be placed on the bounty of an English king, who might happen to give a few marks to the merchant's envoy.[1]

On the merchant producing the letter or letters required, the king granted him a writ of *liberate* to the treasurer. For example, Gregio le Palmer and Raniero Shelebel, the partners of Lionardo Giordani, Lamberto Guardabene, Gualterino Brunetti, Lambertino, Gentile Gentili, Tolomeo Afforci and Uguiccio Bonaventano, and of Bestorio di Guido di Guggio of Siena, produced in July 1227 two letters of 40*l.* each, four of 33*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.*, and two of 26*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* which had been issued in favour of Alexander de Stavenby, bishop of Coventry, on the 26th of the preceding September ('Pat. Roll' 10 Hen. III. m. 1), and one of 20*l.* which had been issued[2] to Philip de Ardern and Peter Grimbaldi, December 1, 1226. The king's writ of *liberate* is entered on the '*Liberate* Roll' (Chanc.) m. 5.

Letters of credit of October 21, 1227, in favour of Alexander de Swereford, archdeacon of Salop, and Master William de Cantilupe, appointed the king's proctors at Rome up to Whitsuntide 1228 ('Pat. Roll' 11 Hen. III. m. 1), were honoured by a writ of *liberate* dated May 5, 1228 ('Archæologia,' xxviii. 261). Masters W. Crespin and W. de Grenlawe, king's proctors to Rome (November 19, 1227, 'Pat. Roll' 12 Hen. III. m. 7), carried nineteen letters of credit, ranging in value from 500 marks to 20*l.*, amounting in all to 2,000*l.* Of these, seven, amounting to 1,006*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*, came in course of payment; one set of merchants of Siena presenting letters to the value of 200*l.* (Appendix C, 7), and other townsmen of theirs (*ib.* 8 and 10) letters to the value of 706*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* There is no writ for the remaining 100*l.*, and it may have been paid in the wardrobe.

When the foreign merchants came to England to obtain repayment of their advances, they sometimes took extra-

[1] See below, pp. 192, 196–7.

[2] Along with another for 20*l.* and one for 26*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* (*Pat. Roll* 11 Hen. III. m. 12.) The bishop had converted all his notes into cash.

ordinary precautions to secure themselves. In Appendix D, I print the document which Chiaro Ugolini, Figlino Guglielmi, and Renucciccio Buonaccorsi obtained from Henry III. in addition to his letters of credit that had been intrusted to Masters Acca and Robert Anketil (see below) and which were in the merchants' possession. By a bond dated August 14, made in the presence of the papal legate (and therefore enforceable with all the sanctions of the Church), the king acknowledged (contrary to fact) that he had received the money at Westminster, and promised that it should be paid within a fortnight of Michaelmas at the New Temple of London.

The ordinary practice was for these payments to be made at the exchequer. When funds were not in hand there, other revenue departments might be drawn upon. On June 1, 1225, Henry III. gave an order[1] to Henry de Sancto Albano and Alexander de Dorset, keepers of the Mint, to pay 1,100 marks to the bearers, merchants of Rome, which sum should be allowed them at the exchequer. Probably this expedient proved unavailing, for the writ is cancelled on the Close Roll, and a note is made referring to the Patent Roll. That roll shows ('Pat. Roll' 9 Hen. III. m. 3, under date June 15) that the king at the New Temple of London delivered (obviously out of the proceeds of the fifteenth, which were then accumulating there) to Henry de Sancto Albano 3,300 marks, to be carried into parts beyond seas to pay merchants of Rome for the advance (*prestito*) made to the king for transacting his affairs in the Curia.

From this period we have many of the 'Issue Memoranda Rolls,' which show that the payments were made fairly promptly. The *liberate* for Chiaro Ugolini for the above-mentioned 600 marks lent to Masters Acca and Robert Anketil in Rome (tested by the king at Westminster, October 11, 1240, in the Chancery enrolment, and the following day in the roll of the Exchequer of Receipt) was paid ('Issue Roll,' Pells, No. 2) on the 15th of that month, and

[1] Printed in *Rot. Lit. Claus.* ii. 42 b.

the similar writ for 25 marks and 3 marks for expenses (tested October 13 on the Chancery Roll, and October 16 on the roll of the Exchequer of Receipt) was paid (*ubi supra*) on October 25. The payment No. 27 to Ranuccio Barboti and Figlino Guglielmi, ordered January 8, 1244, is stated (Bond, xiv) to have been made within the month.

Payment was generally made by tallies on accountants at the Exchequer; for example, Luca de Lucca in Michaelmas term 1272–3 received 500*l.* out of his writ of 1,000*l.* in a tally made to Master Richard de Clifford of the issues of the archbishopric of Canterbury ('Issue Roll,' Auditors' Memoranda, No. 1), and some delay may have occurred before these tallies were realised in cash.

At a later period the delays were very serious. A writ of *liberate* was issued June 8, 1300,[1] to pay the Frescobaldi a sum of 1,387*l.* 12*s.* 0*d.* for which they had made themselves responsible to merchants of Gascony for wines taken for the household over a period that included part of the butlership of Matthew de Columbariis, who died before May 12, 1282. Two days later a tally for 62*l.* 11*s.* 2*d.*, in the name of William de Estaniaco, archdeacon of Lincoln, was handed to them; nine tallies, amounting to 296*l.* 10*s.* 10*d.*, were handed over in the following month; two tallies, amounting to 146*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*, in August; one for 40 m. on November 29; one for 50*l.* three days later, and one for 40*l.* a week later again. On the following day they received a sixteenth tally (for 125*l.* 1*s.* 4*d.*). On various dates in July and August 1301 they received eight tallies, amounting to 396*l.* 15*s.* 5*d.*, and in December 1303 a tally for 171*l.* 14*s.* 1½*d.* But the writ was only fully paid on June 20, 1309, when a tally was issued to them payable by themselves in their capacity of collectors of the old and new custom of wools in England.[2]

Patent, Close, and *Liberate* Rolls show a large number of

[1] *Exch. Tr. Rec.*, Warrants for Issues, Bundle 1 b. The writ is printed carelessly by Bond from the Chancery enrolment (*Liberate Roll*, 28 Edw. I. m. 4) in *Archæologia*, xxviii. 291, No. cix.

[2] A copy of the writ and its indorsements will be found in App. E.

obligations and *liberates* in respect of advances to envoys to the Curia, in addition to those printed by Bond, and a fairly complete list of these transactions in the reign of John and up to the sixteenth year of Henry III.[1] forms Appendix C to this paper.

The earliest direct advance to an English king for his own affairs of which we find evidence was one made to Richard I. by the Bolognese Pietro Guibertini, Giovanni di Sarra, Messer Ugolini Alberici, Giovanni di Paolo di Plebano, Giuliano Arardi, and Radolfo, 'whose son died at sea as a crusader.' Pietro came to Henry III. in 1219 and alleged that Richard had borrowed 300 *m.* sterling and 100*l.* of Tours (say 25*l.* sterling) from the firm in parts beyond seas. The king refused to pay this amount, 'as he did not entirely believe the claimant,' but 'moved by mercy, and at the petition of the legate,' he promised to pay 150 *m.* to Piero on the latter giving a release for the whole debt and accretions and penalties (*accessionibus et pœnis*) and returning the bonds that he had in his custody relating to the matter. Pietro further promised that he would hand over any other like documents that there might be in Bologna. Henry III. wrote to the bishop and the podestà of Bologna (November 20, 1219: 'Pat. Roll' 4 Hen. III. m. 6) to ask them to obtain these documents and to divide the money among the partners according to their rights, and appointed B., the archdeacon of Winchester, his proctor in the matter. To him he doubtless handed the writ, dated November 8, 1219, for the payment to Pietro at the treasury of 100*l.*, of which a duplicate still exists.[2]

[1] See *post*, p. 218, for the reason for closing the list at this point. It must always be remembered that the series of *Liberate* Rolls is not unbroken.

[2] Over two hundred writs of *liberate* are printed by Bond in the paper mentioned. It may be of interest, however, to print this writ here, as relating to the earliest transaction of this class: 'Henricus, *&c.* Liberate de thesauro nostro Petro Gwybertini et sociis suis civibus Bononiæ C libras quas ei debemus pro quietancia debiti Regis Ricardi avunculi nostri quod eis debuit per instrumenta ejusdem Regis quæ habemus in thesauro nostro. Teste H[uberto] de Burgh Justiciario nostro apud Westmonasterium VIII. die Novembris anno regni nostri IIII. Per Dominum Legatum et Dominum Winton. Justiciarium.—*Exch. Treas. Rec., Warrants for Issues*, No. 964.

By a writ[1] dated at Falaise, June 5, 1200, and addressed to Geoffrey Fitz-Peter, the treasurer, and the justices of England, King John acknowledged his indebtedness to Isemberto Selvaggi, Gerardo degli Spaudi, Speroni Bagaroni, and their partners of Piacenza, in 1,000 silver marks (at 13*s.* 4*d.* the mark), payable in two sums of 500 *m.* each, within a fortnight of Michaelmas and Easter respectively.

In no twelfth-century bond given by an English king have I found any definite penalty provided in case of non-payment of the loan at the term fixed. Some such stipulation is implied, however, in the language of the above letter of November 20, 1219. In the second quarter of the thirteenth century the credit of the king of England was not so good in the opinion of certain merchants of Florence and Siena, and it became necessary to provide such a penalty.

By letters patent of March 10, 1232,[2] the king acknowledged the receipt in London (as a loan for the carrying on of his affairs and those of his realm) of 1,200 marks sterling from Vallianto and Gualtero, brothers, sons of Marsilio, Bonaccorso son of Inglesco, Franceschino son of Benuccio, and Contero son of Donato, citizens and merchants of Florence; and renounces all exceptions in respect of payment (*pecuniæ non numeratæ*, and the like). And he promises to repay the same to the merchants, or to one of them, or to their certain messenger who shall produce his bond ('aut eorum certo nuntio præsens instrumentum secum deferenti'), at Michaelmas in the sixteenth year of his reign, at the New Temple of London, without any diminution; with this further provision, that if the sum be not so paid, then within twelve months thereafter (*extunc in anno*) the king promises and is bound by legal stipulation to give and pay to the merchants for each month one mark for each ten marks, in recompense of damages, *interesse*, and expenses ('per singulos menses pro singulis decem marcis sterlingorum unam marcam dictæ

[1] *Charter Roll* 2 John 35, d, in *Rot. Chart.* 96 b.

[2] *Pat. Roll* 16 Hen. III. 7 d, in Shirley, *Roy. Lett. Hen. III.* (Rolls) i. 403–5.

monetæ, pro recompensatione damnorum, interesse, et expensarum'), that is, 120 per cent.,[1] and the expenses of two merchants with two horses and two mounted servants (wheresoever such merchants may be), until payment of the debt and all other sums as above mentioned. And the king promises that he will in no wise reckon the recompense for damages, &c., as part of the principal, nor detain the debt on pretext of the recompense beyond the term specified without the merchants' consent. For the performance of these promises the king binds himself and his heirs, and on his and their behalf renounces all possible exceptions,—including papal pardons, and those arising from the customary law of any country. At the same time, Henry borrowed two sums of 240*l.* and 573*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* from firms of Sienese bankers on identical terms.

Twenty-five years later, we find that the king's borrowings from such bankers in Italy as were *campsores domini papæ*[2] were regulated by the same protocol in most respects as bound ecclesiastics who came up to Rome for the *pallium*, or to ask for favours.[3] An example may be seen in a bond of November 5, 1257,[4] which, under the paternal care of the Curia, secures to the merchants only 60 per cent. per annum for damages, *interesse*, and expenses ; and only one merchant, with one horse and one servant, is to be maintained by the borrower until payment.

In spite of the fact that Henry was now practically a partner of the Holy See in 'the affair of Sicily,' the pope was unable to obtain for him any better terms than his ecclesiastical subjects could have had if they were borrowing money in England from those Caorsins whose arrival in this

[1] In 1239 merchants of Rome and Siena (including Bobo di Giovanni Boboni, a predecessor of the Bonsignori) charged only the same rate of interest to so unimportant a person as the abbot of St. Gall in Lombardy on a loan of 270 silver marks (Schulte, *Handelsverkehr*, i. 248-9).

[2] *E.g.* Angelerio Solaficci and partners of Siena (App. D, No. 15), and many others. See also Muratori, *Antiq. Ital.* i. 889.

[3] See Appendix B.

[4] Rymer's *Fœdera*, i. 365.

country Matthew Paris dates in 1229.[1] He tells us that certain men of Siena, 'feneratores nequissimi,' came over in that year in the suite of Stephen, the pope's chaplain,[2] and (*sub anno* 1235[3]) gives 'the form of the Caorsins of binding their debtors, which every day grows more burdensome (indies tamen ingravescens).' 'The king,' he says, 'was under bond to them for an enormous sum.'

Elaborately as the king bound himself, however, there is still no evidence that he paid any money beyond the principal in respect of these loans.

When merchants came to England and followed the court, suing for their debt, the king frequently gave them a present for their trouble. Entries on the *Misæ* Roll of 11 John[4] show some small payments so made to merchants of Piacenza; but the only instance that I have found of a *pro rata* payment is in a writ of *liberate* on the Chancery *Liberate* Roll of 21 Henry III. m. 2, dated at Cliffe, August 31, 1237, and addressed to the treasurer and chamberlains, ordering them to pay to Vermeio Lorenzi[5] and

[1] In this connexion it may be noted that the earliest references to English sterlings that Professor Patetta (*Bull. senese di Storia patria* iv. 320) has found in the Archives of Siena are in *Archivio generale*, 1228, June 26 and October 30, and 1229, March 6.

[2] *Chron. Maj.* (Rolls) iii. 188–9.

[3] *Chron. Maj.* (Rolls) iii. 328–31. A notarial copy of an actual bond in somewhat similar terms, granted by N., the prior, and the Convent of Sempringham in 1250 to Iacopo Uguiccione and Godofredo Renieri in London, partners of Alessandro Salimbene and Reginaldo Giovanelli and their partners of Siena, had been described from a Vercelli MS. in Turin (D. 5.29), by Professor Patetta in the *Bullettino senese di Storia patria*, iv. (1897) 311–344. The variations from the formula given by Matthew Paris are recorded at pp. 322 *sq.* The loan in this case was of 168 *m.*, of which 80 *m.* were to be repaid at Easter 1251, and the balance at midsummer of that year. In default, 60 per cent. for recompense (as above) and the expenses of a merchant with a horse and a servant until full payment should be made.

[4] 1209, December 20. At Winchester, for the expenses of merchants of Piacenza for the past six days, 1*l.* 18*s.* 6*d.* paid to John of Lisieux. (Ed. 1844, 143.)

1210, February 5. At the Tower of London. To Paganus Plangburn and Guidotto, Pastorello, and Gerardo, merchants of Piacenza, who came into England for their debt which they lent to the Emperor by the king's license, twenty marks, of the king's gift. (*Ibid.* 148.)

[5] Called 'Vermulgio Laurentii' in a recognizance of January 1236, whereby

Reniero Orlandi, merchants of Rome, 54 marks for the respite of a loan of 660 marks made to Simon Steiland and Peter Sarracenus for the king's business in the court of Rome. The writ for the principal sum had been dated six months and nineteen days earlier, so that the 54 marks represents only the very moderate rate of 14*l.* 18*s.* 7½*d.* per centum per annum.

On October 16, 1240, Chiaro Ugolini of Florence, who had advanced various sums to William, bishop of Valence, and Robert Anketil, was given by the king three marks to pay his expenses, of the king's gift (*Liberate* Roll, Exch. of Receipt, 1240–1); and there are two or three other similar payments,[1] amounting in the whole to less than 40*l.*

During the period covered by this paper, *i.e.* to 1303, four large cash payments were made to Italian bankers,[2] amounting in the whole to 7,333*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.*[3] But the sole motive of the king seems to have been to insure that the firms named should not become bankrupt, and thus unable

(in supplement to a bond) William de Gloucestria and Richard de Langedon bound Henry III. to pay to Lorenzi and his partner 100 *m.* at the New Temple at the octave of St. John Baptist. There is no provision as to damages, expenses, or *interesse* in this recognizance. (*Diplom. Doc.* Chanc. No. 9.)

[1] Two may be noted here: on August 11, 1243, Henry III. ordered (*Rôles Gascons*, i. No. 1870) payment to certain Florentine merchants of twenty marks, which Bartholomew Peche received from them as a loan when he went as the king's envoy to the Emperor, *et ijas marcas de pœna quia non observavit diem inter ipsum et prædictos mercatores præfixum de mutuo prædicto eis reddendo.*

The Issue Roll (Pells) for Easter, 43 Hen. III., m. 1, shows a payment of twenty marks to Guido Bonconti, merchant, of the king's gift, for the damages which he sustained by reason of the loan he made to the king. It may be noted that payment of this sum had been ordered by a writ of *liberate* dated April 15 of the preceding year. (*Liberate Roll*, Exch. of Rec., 1258–9.)

[2] On November 4, 1290, five thousand marks were granted to the Ricciardi of Lucca for their services at the court of Rome, the sum to be paid June 25, 1291. (*Pat. Roll* 18 Edw. I. m. 2.) The sums received by the Frescobaldi are set forth below.

[3] For the sake of completeness, note must here be made of a comparatively small payment of this sort, and the only one recorded in the reign of Henry III. By writ of February 26, 1272, the king ordered the treasurer and chamberlains to pay to Poncius de Mora, his merchant, 133*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.*, 'which the king granted him of his gift, in recompense of the damages sustained by Poncius in the loan of money made at various times to the king.' (*Liberate Roll*, Chanc., 56 Hen. III. m. 9; Bond, xlvi. b.)

to make him further advances. As showing the arguments used by the merchants to win these large sums, I may translate a letter from 'the king's merchants of the Frescobaldi,'[1] which must be later than April 5, 1301, and earlier than August 23, 1302, on which later date 10,000*l.* was charged on the customs for the merchants' use. It is probably the petition on the strength of which that grant was made.

'To our Lord the King your merchants of the Company of the Frescobaldi of Florence say, That they have lent you in divers sums, as appears in rolls of account made with your Ministers and by your letters, 49,329*m.* 9*s.* 4*d.* sterling, from the year of grace 1294 up to the present. Whereof they have paid in Florence and in the fairs of Champagne 22,868*m.* 11*s.* 1*d.* sterling of expenses (*de costages*). Item, they are damaged by bad sales of wool and loss of exchange in the time aforesaid to do your business, 4,000*m.* sterling. Whereof your Treasurer always said to them: "Do not trouble for bad sales of wool or loss of exchange, for the king will put all right." Item, they are damaged in salaries and expenses of their factors in the time aforesaid, who have remained in England, France, and Ireland to do your business, 2,000*m.* sterling. Item, they are damaged in respect of 2,000*m.* sterling which you caused to be delivered to them last year and of 9,000*m.* sterling that you assigned to them on the fifteenth, 2,000*m.*, because they bought the mark sterling at about five gold florins, and now they are worth less than four. Item, they are damaged in that, owing to the aforesaid advance that they have made you, they have not been credited by other merchants, nor have they been able to carry on trade in the time aforesaid, and were obliged to deliver back 200,000 gold florins that they had in deposit from honest men, of which the damage is so great that they dare not write it. But of this damage, and of all other the damages aforesaid, they put themselves, if it please you, at the award of your royal lordship. And if any man doubt of any of the things aforesaid, the said merchants are ready to give him certainty.'

[1] *Ancient Correspondence*, xlvii. 120.

At the foot of the petition the merchants mention what they have received from the king in recoupment of these grievous losses.[1]

1. The king had given them, in three instalments, 4,000*l.*[2] sterling.

2. On March 14, 1300,[3] Edward had appointed the Frescobaldi to the custody, during pleasure, of the Exchanges of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Kingston-upon-Hull, Exeter, and Dublin. From this source they realised 1,800*l.*

3. The next item, of 666*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* profit from the exchange of money of Tours which the Frescobaldi had paid beyond seas, having received sterlings in England, shows that there had been a great fall in the value of the pound *tournois* abroad. The payments had been made, in accordance with the then practice of the Exchequer, at the rate of 1*l.* sterling to 4*l.* *tournois*, and the merchants honestly accounted for the gain thus made by them.

4. On April 12, 1300,[4] Edward had given them licence to change and purchase throughout the realm silver, pollards and crockards, and all other white money counterfeited for sterlings, on condition of bringing the resulting silver and plates to the mints of England and Dublin to be exchanged. On these operations[5] they account for a profit of 333*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.*

It has been generally believed that the control of the

[1] 'Ces sunt les profitz que lesditz marchanz ont eu de nostre seignur le Rey en lauantdit tens. Cestassauoir nostre seignur le Rey lour dona par iij fois : iiij^{m} li desterlinges.

'Item ont gaigne du Change que il lour dona : ij^{m} vij^{c} mars desterlinges.

'Item ont gaigne du change de Tornois que il ont pays de la outre, et ont resceu les Esterlins pardeca : m. mars desterlinges.

'Item ont gaigne en ce que hom lour ad acunte Esterlins pur pollardz : v^{c} mars desterlinges.'

[2] On April 12, 1300, Edward granted 1,000*l.* (*Pat. Roll* 28 Edw. I. m. 18) and on April 5, 1301, 2,000*l.* (*Pat. Roll* 29 Edw. I. m. 19). I am unable to find when the second payment of 1,000*l.* was made.

[3] *Pat. Roll* 28 Edw. I. m. 21. *ced.*

[4] *Ibid.* m. 20.

[5] Facilitated, apparently, by the authorities. On June 11 a number of double pollards, to the amount of 326*l.* 3*s.* 11½*d.*, were delivered, under the order of the Treasurer of the Exchequer, to the Frescobaldi, to be melted down as well at York as at Newcastle. *Liber Quotid. Contrarotularii* 28 Edw. I. fo. 67, in Frost, *Hull*, 60, note.

Customs, which were intrusted to Italian merchants as security for their advances,[1] gave them a considerable profit. The allowances, however, for the charge of the customs were very small, and the enrolled accounts show that every halfpenny, whether of tronage, cocket, or *incrementum obolorum et quadrantum*, was exactly accounted for at the Exchequer. Mr. Hall has shown[2] that the two collectors of the Great Customs in London in the last years of Edward I. and the first years of Edward II. (when these customs realised about 4,800*l.* annually) were paid only 20*l.* a year each, in addition to allowances for expenses.

The figures as to Hartlepool and Newcastle which I append in a note show that the percentage expenses of collection in the former small port were 4*l.* 5*s.* 10½*d.* against the very low rate of 2*l.* 18*s.* 2*d.* in the larger port.[3]

In the account rendered by Orlandino di Poggio

[1] On March 27, 1275, Luke de Lucca and his partners were appointed (*Pat. Roll* 3 Edw. I. m. 29) to take a certain custom called 'the New Aid,' levied on goods and merchandise coming into England.

[2] *History of Customs* (1885), ii. 46.

[3]

Newcastle:	£	s.	d.
1304, April 1—1306, April 4. Amount of Old Customs.	1,158	16	8
1304, July 12—1306, April 4. Amount of New Customs	112	8	8
To the Keepers for mises and expenses	12	15	8
viz.:	£	s.	d.
For Old Custom	4	13	4 a year
,, New ,, ...	2	0	0 ,,
To the clerk writing the cocket for both customs in the office aforesaid. . .	2	0	0 ,,
In the hire of a house for receiving both customs and for transacting other business affecting the same. . . .	1	0	0 ,,
To the troner	1	10	0 ,,
Wax and parchment bought for the cocket.		11	8 ,,
To two men keeping the port, lest wool, hides, or other merchandise should be transported uncustomed . . .		6	8 ,,
Hartlepool:			
1324, January 23—1325, September 29. Old and New Customs	130	15	4½
To the keepers for mises and expenses at 5 marks a year	5	12	4

(*de Podio*) and Federigo Venturi, of the Ricciardi of Lucca, of their receipts from January 1, 1290, to August 7, 1294 (Pipe Roll, 26 Edward I. m. 35 d.), they debit themselves with four years' Great Customs from Easter 1290 to Easter 1294, to the amount in all of 46,256*l.* 19*s.*, and claim, *per contra*, 'To themselves, for mises and expenses in the collection of the custom of wools, &c., with expenses and fees of keepers, hire of houses, and small expenses' for the same period, 1,138*l.* 0*s.* 7½*d.*, being a percentage of 2*l.* 9*s.* 10½*d.*

I am disposed to think that there are few, if any, governments to-day that collect their export duties so cheaply.

Some Italian merchants obtained from the king, when he was indebted to them, special licences to export wool without paying customs; but in most cases they duly accounted for the duty later, so that their gain (if any) must have been merely in the time of recouping themselves for advances. The collector made a note of the amount in his account, and was not debited with it at the Exchequer. For example, in the discharge of the account of the collectors of the subsidy in London from July 29, 1294, to Michaelmas 1297 (*Enrolled Accounts*, Customs L.T.R., No. 1, m. 24) it is noted that the Frescobaldi, who exported forty-nine sacks and twenty cloves of wool in the twenty-third and twenty-fourth years, must answer for 98*l.* 15*s.* 4½*d.* custom thereon, debited above to the customer.[1] This amount was only

[1] At the same time similar allowances were made to the following Italian merchants, all being members of the syndicate of eleven societies to whom the king was indebted in 28,966*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* See App. A.

	Sacks.	Cl.	£	s.	d.
Mozzi, of Florence	33	26	67	0	0
Spini, of Florence	82	26	165	0	0
Bardi, of Florence	10	0	20	0	0
Cerchi neri, of Florence . . .	157	0	314	0	0
Cerchi bianchi, of Florence . . .	11	0	22	0	0
Pulci and Rembertini, of Florence .	10	0	20	0	0
James Janiani, of the society of John Frescobaldi of Florence . . .	86	26	173	0	0

brought into account with the Exchequer in 1309, when it forms one of a smaller number of similar debts in the statement [1] presented by the Frescobaldi to the auditors appointed by Edward II. on April 16, 1309.[2]

It is therefore clear that the Italian farmer of the customs did not gain appreciably at the expense of the Crown. He was indeed able to employ the members of his family or of his firm in the subordinate offices of the customs; but his advantage must have lain in the power to exact fees and douceurs from individual exporters as a condition for cocketing their wools and hides, and other facilities in export. At a later date we find record of two such methods of extortion, which probably had their counterparts in the thirteenth century.

In 1347 the Commons alleged [3] that 'certain merchants who had the king's custom and subsidy for a certain sum by the year, by colour of a purchase made by them of the king's wools, suffer no man to pass with wools save such wool as belongs to the merchants, if they advance not on a sack of wool two marks beyond the custom and subsidy.' And the merchants were accordingly ordered 'to be summoned in parliament, and have their answer.' And in 1371 we have the complaint [4] that 'the farmers of the customs, having weighed and cocketed the wool, accused the exporters of attempting to pass more in their sarplers than was recorded; and on the testimony of a single witness, the Barons of the Exchequer adjudged the forfeiture of certain men's wools that had been so weighed and cocketed.' This latter would obviously be a most effective way of obtaining money, and one can hardly wonder at popular indignation being roused against the farmers even by a suspicion of such conduct.

The real burden of the loans made to the Crown, in fact, lay upon the subjects in indirect ways, not through the

[1] *Accounts*, Exchequer, K.R., Bundle 126, No. 9, m. 1.
[2] *Close Roll* 2 Edw. II. m. 11
[3] *Rot. Parl.* ii. 169.
[4] *Rot. Parl.* ii. 307 b.

national Exchequer. In addition to their power, when actually collecting the king's customs, to use the process of the Exchequer, some Italian merchants, and others who had lent money to the king, were granted special facilities in the conduct of their private business. As foreigners they had few rights in the eyes of the common law. But the king not only granted them licences to trade throughout the realm,[1] and to recover their debts,[2] but also to reside there[3] and purchase real property. The assignment of any branch of the royal revenue brought the assignee into the class of king's farmers. Blackstone[4] states the common law of the late thirteenth as well as of the eighteenth century, when he says of the Exchequer:

'As all the officers and ministers of the court have, like those of other superior courts, the privilege of suing and being sued only in their own court, so also the king's debtors and farmers, and all accomptants of the exchequer, are privileged to sue and implead all manner of persons in the same court of equity that they themselves are called into.' 'The writ,' he adds, 'upon which all proceedings are grounded is called a *quo minus*, in which the plaintiff suggests that he is the king's farmer or debtor, and that the defendant hath done him the injury or damage complained of, *quo minus sufficiens existit*, by which he is the less able to pay the king his debt or rent.'

This access to the Exchequer, with its speedier process and more summary execution, was granted not only to Italian merchants who were actually farmers or accountants,

[1] On March 12, 1232, Contadino, merchant of Siena, had the king's letters to come to England, to trade there, and to return thence, up to Christmas, 1232. (*Pat. Roll* 16 Hen. III. m. 7.)

[2] On July 23, 1227, Gregorio Palmieri (*le Palmer*) of Siena was granted protection (for himself and his servants) in the lands and revenues of Robert Passelewe, which he had from Robert in quittance of a debt, specially against Robert's servants; such letters to last until the debt was paid.

[3] In spite of occasional reversions to the old law, as when (July 16, 1275, *Close Roll* 3 Edw. I. m. 7) the king ordered the mayor and sheriffs of London not to permit strange merchants to stay in the city after the fortieth day after their entry into the city; 'but they shall sell their wines and wares within the said forty days.'

[4] *Comm.* III. iv. 45.

but to some who were apparently merely creditors of the king. In 1276 the king recites that he had granted to Teglaro Amatori and Loterio Bonaguidi and their partners, merchants of Florence, the right to summon their debtors before the barons, so that they may recover their debts in the Exchequer, according to the custom thereof.[1] The king did not always allow this right unchecked; for the record goes on to recite that the merchants had summoned the prior of Montacute before the barons to answer for a debt of 100 marks. Whereupon the king orders the barons to allow no further proceedings in the same plea in the Exchequer.

One consequence of this right was the use of the Court of Exchequer for the enrolment of recognizances given to the merchants in their lending of money and their purchase of wools. The securing of loans by recognizance, already established in 1201,[2] was practised in the Common Bench[3] and the Chancery,[4] but was most frequent in the Exchequer. The borrower promised payment of the debt, and granted that, in case of non-payment at the term specified, the money should be levied 'by whatsoever distress the treasurer and barons of the Exchequer should be pleased to make, and that he would make good all damages the lender should sustain by non-payment, and that the borrower should be distrained in like manner for the rendering of such damages.'[5]

[1] *Memoranda*, Communia, Mich. 4 and 5 Edw. I. m. 1, in Madox, *Exch.* (1711), p. 597. Such grants took the following form: 'To the barons of the Exchequer. Order that they cause such debts due to William de Tournemyre and William Servat [of Cahors] and other their partners in England as they shall reasonably prove, to be paid and owed according to the custom of the Exchequer.' *Memoranda*, *K.R.*, Mich. 9 Edw. I., m. 3. A similar grant to the Florentine Diotaiuto Guglielmi, merchant of the queen-mother (whom Henry III. had done his best to make for all purposes a citizen of London: *Engl. Hist. Rev.* xviii. 315), is enrolled on the Exchequer *Memoranda Roll* of Trinity 1276, m. 10, and printed in Maynard's *Reports* (1678), p. 6.

[2] Pollock and Maitland, *Hist. Engl. Law*, ii. 202; see W. P. Baildon, *Sel. Civil Pleas* (1890), p. 42. We find enrolments also on an Assize Roll. See *Cartul. Abbatiæ de Rievalle* (1889), 409.

[3] See *Calendar of Close Rolls* 2 Edw. II., p. 141.

[4] See *Close Rolls*, passim.

[5] *Recognitio Philippi de Arcy: Communia*, Easter, 41 Hen. III., in *Memoranda*, L.T.R., m. 14.

In the early years of Edward I. we find that a considerable number of membranes of the Memoranda Rolls are set apart for recognizances, and that a large proportion of these are made in favour of Italian and Caorsin merchants.[1] An examination of these rolls would throw valuable light, not only on the general economic history of the period, but also on the lives of many prominent individuals and families.

A further extension of the same doctrine might place the royal prerogatives at the disposal of the king's merchant in the case of the death of one who was constructively a Crown debtor.

A writ to the official of the bishop of Norwich, dated October 7, 1279,[2] recites that John le Gros, recently deceased, was indebted to the king and his merchants of Lucca (*nobis et mercatoribus nostris de Luk'*) in 684*l.* 14*s.* 0*d.* for divers debts, and that the king, 'according to the ancient and approved custom which, among others, so adorns his royal dignity that he is preferred to all of his realm as to the receipt of his debts,' has for this cause seized John's goods and chattels; and he orders the official to summon the executors, to compel them to pay the debt, and to supersede all process of other creditors until this debt is paid, upon pain of the king's grievous displeasure.[3] The principle of law upon which the writ was founded is common to all monarchical governments, and had the sanction of the Great Charter[4]

[1] In Michaelmas term, 1278, the single firm of the Ricciardi of Lucca appear as creditors in eleven recognizances, to the total amount of 1,399*l.* 1*s.* 9*d.*, and in later terms the number and the amounts are larger still.

[2] Repeating the order contained in a writ of which I have not found the enrolment, but which was issued prior to April 1, 1279 (*Memoranda*, L.T.R., Easter, 7 Edw. I. m. 4). The writ of October 7, is printed, with some errors, in Sir J. Maynard's *Reports* (1678), p. 10.

[3] 'Scientes etiam pro certo quod si secus actum vel attemptatum per vos fuerit in præmissis, nos, eo potius quod res nostra agitur, manum correctionis qualem decebit contra vos ad hoc apponemus' (*Memoranda*, L.T.R., Mich. 7 Edw. I., m. 2 (K.R. 1 b). The energy of the language suggests that John de Cobbeham (in whose name the writ was tested) had reason to fear that the ecclesiastic addressed might assert his exclusive jurisdiction in the matter against the royal command.

[4] Sect. 26 in Stubbs's *Sel. Charters* (1895), p. 300:—'If any that holds of us a lay fee should die, and the sheriff or our bailiff show our letters patent of summons

in England. Madox appears to record only another instance [1] of this extended application. Both were in favour of the Riccardi, who were actually creditors of the Crown to a large amount. Inasmuch, however, as they were potentially the king's debtors in respect of their receipt of his customs and other funds, he was entitled to safeguard his interests by proceedings analogous to the much commoner garnishee process,[2] which was used in case of an actually ascertained debt to the king from the creditor.

Such Italian bankers as added to their position as merchants of the king of England that of being *mercatores domini papæ* had, as Schneider points out,[3] an immense advantage in the command they possessed of large sums in actual cash. Bills or similar documents conveyed the value to their partners in Siena, Florence, or Pistoia, who handed the cash represented by them to the apostolic chamber—or (as very frequently happened) merely credited the chamber in their own ledgers with the amount of the bills in part payment of a papal overdraft. The commerce in which they had hitherto been engaged proved inadequate to employ the funds now in their possession, and they were in a position to advance to the Crown far larger sums than their predecessors had done, and to lend large sums to the subjects of the realm. The new employment brought other advantages to their ordinary business. As collectors of the census, of aids for the Holy Land, of legacies to the Church or of other revenues

for a debt that the deceased owed to us, it shall be lawful for the sheriff or bailiff to attach and imbreviate the chattels of the deceased in the lay fee to the value of the debt by view of lawful men. But so that nothing be removed until the debt that was clear shall have been paid to us, and the residue be left to the executors, to perform the will of the deceased.' Instances of the levy of such direct debts are common enough (Madox, *Hist. Exch.* (1711) XXII. vii. 562–3).

[1] *Ibid.* xii. 669, citing *Communia* of Trinity 1290. This writ directs the barons of the Exchequer to levy on the goods of John, late bishop of Ely, the debts of Ricardo Guidiccioni and Orlandino de Poggio 'ac si debita Regis propria fuerint,' without the fictitious statement of the writ of 1279 that they were also the king's debts.

[2] See Madox, *ubi sup.* p. 666.

[3] *Finanz. Bezieh. florent. Bankiers z. Kirche* (1899), chapter I.

of the Holy See, they were its factors and agents. In some cases they were also its debtors. In each of these capacities they were entitled to, and they received, the support of the Church in all their loan transactions. That their debtors should fulfil their obligations was a matter that affected the finances of the Church. Consequently, the Church's spiritual weapons were at their disposal for the enforcement of their credits.

In some cases this seems natural enough, where the moneys had been not only borrowed but actually applied under the direct sanction of the Curia. The loans of 1255 obtained by Peter of Aigueblanche under his power of attorney [1] afford an instance of this class. Ralph de Rumiliaco, dean of the church of St. Mary of Troyes, received letters apostolic of June 12, 1255, reciting the bond of the abbot of Osney, and continuing:

'If you find the money has not been paid, you will excommunicate the abbot and convent, announcing it on Sundays and feast-days, *pulsatis campanis et candelis accensis*, until satisfaction is made to the merchants, with just and moderate expenses and due recoupment of damages . . . *usuris omnino cessantibus*. If two months later the money has not been paid, you will suspend them from the administration of spirituals and temporals.'

On the 11th of the preceding month, there was addressed to the dean of St. Etienne in the same city of Troyes, and to the official of Troyes, a papal letter [2] which does not at first strike one as so reasonable. The persons named are to cause payment to be made within two months to Rinaldo and Tolomeo di Jacopo and their companions, merchants of Siena in France, 'of the credits that they have against various bishops, abbots, convents, communities, barons, &c.' The debtors who do not pay within the time aforesaid are to be punished with excommunication and interdict.

[1] *Annales de Oseneia* in *Ann. Mon.* (Rolls) iv. 107–112.

[2] *Archivio della famiglia Tolomei di Siena*, No. 10, in Paoli and Piccolomini, *Lettere volgari del secolo XIII.* (1871), p. 129.

On consideration, however, this falls under the same principles as the previous transaction.

With such support from the secular and the spiritual arm, it is hardly surprising that those Italians who were now primarily merchants of money 'infected the whole land, from the dwellers in London down to citizens and countrymen,'[1] with usury; and that those who had come to England originally for legitimate trade[2] followed their fellows' example and lent their surplus funds to the king,[3] to his magnates, and to the monasteries and private individuals whose wool they bought for the looms of Florence.

This lending of money at interest was obviously one of the chief sources of the Italian merchants' profit; but on various occasions it caused ruin and loss to them when popular or royal indignation was roused against them, and they were obliged to flee for their lives. The countenance of a distant pope proved no adequate defence when Roger, bishop of London, anathematised the Caorsins and banished them from his diocese in 1235,[4] in spite of the support of 'judges that were servants (*familiaribus*) to the Caorsins, whom they had elected for their will.'

The king, too, for reasons of his own, might, as Henry III.

[1] Matt. Paris, *Hist. Angl.* (Rolls), ii. 382, an. 1235. I find little actual evidence of such infection in his time, however.

[2] On July 9, 1224, Ranuccio Spinelli and Restauro Gregorio of Siena, and Donato, Simonetto, and Guido della Spada of Florence, had licence to come and trade in England up to Christmas of the same year. (*Pat. Roll* 8 Hen. III. m. 7.) And on September 23 and October 25 the Florentine merchants named had (with other partners) licences to make two voyages from England with cargoes of their goods without hindrance. (*Ibid.* m. 3, m. 2.)

[3] The Florentine merchants from whom Henry III. borrowed (as mentioned on p. 194) 1,200*m.* at 120 per cent. in 1232 were apparently of the same firm as, on September 14, 1226, had licence to lade ten bales (*truscellos*, doubtless of wool) on a ship at Shoreham and take the same to parts beyond seas, in spite of the king's order for the arrest of all ships (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. 137 b) on their return after a business voyage, for which they had licence on the previous July 7. (*Ibid.* 128 b.)

[4] M. Paris, *Chron. Maj.* (Rolls) iii. 332. See also his account of the result of the flight in 1245 of Master Martin, the pope's clerk, when he ran great risk of being murdered. (*Ibid.* iv. 422.)

did in 1240, banish them;[1] but by bribery they generally succeeded in evading the decrees, and large numbers concealed themselves in the realm, either with their debtors or with the *quosdam literatos*[2] whom they had infected with their pernicious practices, or the 'magnates whose money they put out for gain after the example of the Roman Curia.'

In 1251, the king, being 'sorely wounded in conscience,'[3] at last obtained a judgment of the court against the usurers, and seized some and delivered them to imprisonment, to the great joy of the Jews, who 'now had some one to share their slavery,' while some concealed themselves, and others fled the realm. But at length, by payment of a very great sum, these Caorsins were let go in peace for a time. 'And,' adds Matthew, 'one of them said to me, who write of these matters, and confirmed it with a great oath, that if they had not bought themselves costly houses in London, hardly one of them would have stayed in England.' The decision of the Court purported to be based on a charge that the Caorsins were 'schismatics and heretics and guilty of high treason . . . inasmuch as they, professing to be Christians, defiled the whole realm of England with the shameful gain of usury.'

One difficulty felt by popes and kings in their action against such men arose from the fact that from the point of view of canon law it is impossible for a *societas* to be guilty of usury, and that this crime can only be committed by individuals. Alvarus Pelagius,[4] writing before 1383, asks: 'What is the case of cities or associations (*collegia*) that give money on usury? Is each person in them a usurer, and bound to restitution?' And replies: 'It seems not, for the case of a *universitas* is not the case of the individuals who compose it;' and he rebuts an analogy that might be drawn from the treatment of delicts by the canon law, wherein 'all

[1] M. Paris, *Chron. Maj.* (Rolls) iv. 8: 'And in particular those of Siena.'
[2] M. Paris, *Hist. Angl.* (Rolls) ii. 382.
[3] M. Paris, *Chron. Maj.* (Rolls) v. 245.
[4] *De Planctu Ecclesiæ* (1474), ii. 46 R.

who consent in the action are punished and individually bound, not as a *universitas*, which has no soul,[1] and therefore is not subject to ecclesiastical censures.

Endemann [2] has produced evidence which seems to prove that the chief object of money-lenders trading in partnership was thus to evade the usury laws. This view is supported also by Dr. Richard Ehrenberg: [3] 'Mir scheint, dass Goldschmidt in seiner Polemik gegen Endemann (*Universalgesch. des Handelsrechts*, i. 140 ff.) doch die Bedeutung der Wucherlehre für das praktische Leben unterschätzt. Sie war ja in der That nur ein Ausfluss der ganzen mittelälterlichen Weltanschauung, und soweit diese im Volke noch festwurzelte, hatte auch jene noch erhebliche praktische Bedeutung.' And I cannot admit that this evidence has been disposed of by Max Weber, who maintains,[4] on the other hand, that Lastig and he have proved that the *societates* were in fact merely an extension of the principle of associations already existing (at Pisa and elsewhere) for shipping business, which paid a fixed dividend.[5]

Whether legally banished or not, the Italian merchants were not allowed to return to England without contributing to the royal revenue. In *Liber A.*[6] are transcribed notifications made on May 14, 1262, by Reniero Bonaccorsi, Diotaviva Guidi, and Enrico Herenno of Siena, partners of the Bonsignori, 'exchangers of the pope's chamber.' They were commended to Henry by Urban IV.,[7] who desired the

[1] Cf. Blackstone, *Comm.* i. 477. English law has added that it has no mind. Per Alderson, B., 10 *Exch.* 356.

[2] *Studien in der romanisch-kanonistischen Wirtschafts- und Rechtslehre* (1874–83).

[3] *Das Zeitalter der Fugger* (1896), i. 32 *note*.

[4] *Zur Geschichte der Handelsgesellschaften im Mittelalter* (1899) iv. 113-4.

[5] 'That method of employing capital reached its development before the supremacy of the doctrine of usury, and later, when that doctrine had attained a real significance, was sacrificed to it. This was not indeed because of the sharing of the risk, but because of the *certum lucrum*, which shows clearly that the prohibition of usury was not the origin of its characteristic structure.' (*Ibid.* p. 109.)

[6] Fo. 209, 209 b.

[7] Bull of December 30, 1261, in Rymer's *Fœdera*, i. 414.

king to give them aid and allow them to reside quietly in London. They were trusted with the transmission of all moneys collected in England and Ireland for the Roman Church or the Holy Land, as well as the royal census of 1,000 marks,[1] and were especially commended to the queen's favour. In spite of these evidences of their honour, each of the partners executes a document in the following terms:

'Whereas the king formerly ordered me and other merchants of Siena in England to depart the realm and not return without his will and assent and that of Edward his firstborn, and I, on the advice of certain persons, entered the realm without such assent, and, fearing his indignation, begged through friends that I might remain in the realm till a month after midsummer, which the king granted, and I, of my goodwill, granted to the Lord Edward 500*m.* for myself and my partners, and I bind myself and them never to demand the same sum in any way.'

These documents are further vouched by being sealed by Baroncino Galteri of Lucca, then a thriving silk merchant in the city, and afterwards the chief member in England of the firm of Ricciardi—and by Diotaiuto Guglielmi of Florence, banker to Queen Eleanor.

In the reign of Edward I. we occasionally find commissions of inquiry or of oyer and terminer as to usury, and probably others will come to light when the Patent Rolls of Henry III. are printed; but there is little evidence that more was intended than a replenishment of the royal coffers by the fines to be extracted from the wealthy defendants for their pardons.

On November 9, 1274 for example, a mandate[2] was issued to the mayor and sheriffs of London, ordering proclamation to be made in the city that all merchant usurers shall depart thence within twenty days from that date, and shall leave the kingdom, under pain of forfeiture of their bodies and goods; and if they be thereafter found in the city, the mayor and sheriffs shall cause them to be

[1] *Reg. Cam. Urb.* IV. Nos. 10, 48, 51, 52.
[2] *Close Roll* 2 Edw. I. m. 1.

arrested and kept safely until further orders, as the king wills that merchant usurers shall not stay in the city or elsewhere in the realm.

This was followed on January 25, 1275, by an order[1] to Joseph de Chancy, the treasurer, and to John de Lovetot and Geoffrey de Neubaud, that 'they shall inquire cautiously whether any merchant usurers are found in the city of London or elsewhere in the realm, and shall cause the bodies and goods and chattels of any such to be arrested and kept safely until otherwise ordered, as . . . the king learns that some of them dwell in the city and elsewhere in the realm contrary to the inhibition.'

A batch of pardons for the trespasses for which Italian bankers were indicted before these justices are entered on the Patent Roll[2] in the following June. The consideration for such pardons is indicated by a receipt, dated May 18,[3] whereby Giles de Audenard, keeper of the Tower of London, by the king's order and in his name, acknowledged 133*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* in cash, paid by Jacopo di Pistoia, of the Society of Jacopo Ammanati, 'by which he made fine with the king for divers trespasses.'[4]

Another occasion when the investigation of allegations against Italian merchants brought profit to the Crown was the scrutiny made in 1300 under the 'Statutum de falsa moneta' of the previous May.[5] On April 8,[6] pardons were granted to six Florentine firms, to the Ammanati of Pistoia, the Bellardi of Lucca, and the Bonsignori of Siena, 'of any action the king might have against them, as it appears that they have behaved well in carrying on their merchandise, and that they have offended against no ordinance in carrying or sending money or silver out of the realm or in bringing small money into the realm, or in exchanging money, or in buying goods with bad or prohibited money.'

[1] *Close Roll* 3 Edw. I. m. 23.
[2] 3 Edw. I. m. 21.
[3] *Diplomatic Documents*, Chancery, No. 33.
[4] Cf. the acquittances of February 7, 1277, on *Pat. Roll* 5 Edw. I. m. 22.
[5] *Statutes* (Record ed.), i. 133.
[6] *Pat. Roll* 28 Edw. I. m. 20.

Three days later eight of the firms named advanced to the king 1,900*l.*, paid to John de Sandale, the keeper of the Mint in London, 'in order to make exchange therewith;' Edward promising repayment at All Saints. It is obvious that the real consideration for the pardons was the agreement to make these advances, to say nothing of incidental fees exacted in the Wardrobe and the Hanaper. This conclusion is supported by the fact that a similiar investigation took place four months later and was followed by nearly identical pardons.[1]

In their dealings with borrowers the Italian money-lenders obtained bonds from them, whose conditions did not differ much from those demanded by the Jews.[2] The usual terms of such bonds are set out by Matthew Paris,[3] who has also recorded for us the words in which the great Bishop of Lincoln contrasted the Jewish money-lender with the Italian. As Grosseteste lay dying he summoned certain of his clerks, 'that they might be refreshed by conversation,' and among other matters he described, with a feeling that argues personal experience, the proceedings of these exchangers of the pope. 'For example,' he said, 'I receive a loan of 100 marks for a year for 100*l.* I am compelled to make and sign a writing in which I confess that I have received 100*l.* to be repaid at the end of the year. And if by chance thou shouldst wish to pay the principal of the money received within a month or shorter period, he will not receive any less than the full 100*l.* And these terms are more oppressive than those of the Jews, for whenever you bring the principal to a Jew he receives it graciously, with so much interest as corresponds to the time of the loan.'[4]

In addition to the possibility he shared with the Jew of injury to his person and destruction of his business from a sudden awakening of the royal or the popular conscience to

[1] *Pat. Roll* 28 Edw. I. membs. 9, 8.

[2] The recognizances above described were not the primary security, and were not made for every loan.

[3] See above, p. 196, note 3.

[4] M. Paris, *Chron. Maj.* (Rolls) v. 405.

the wickedness of usury, the Italian merchant was subject to the chances of the politics of his native city, and might be reduced to penury or banished the realm owing to events entirely beyond his control.

In 1262, after the defeat of the Guelfs at Montaperti, the relations between the Sienese and Urban IV. became more and more strained. Siena drew her supplies of corn from Sicily, and was consequently dependent on Manfred's friendship. In his support and to intimidate the debt-laden pontiff, the Council of Twenty-four proposed to call home all the Sienese merchants in the Curia and in France, and certain bankers, heavily indebted to the Curia, claimed that they should pay nothing more than the capital deposited with them, and refused to deliver up letters apostolic with which they had been intrusted for the exaction of certain revenues in England (*Reg. Urb. IV.* No. 144). This seriously crippled the pope's resources, and he responded by excommunicating the merchants of Siena wheresoever dwelling, absolved their debtors from their debts (*ibid.* No. 175), and ordered the legate in France and England to sequestrate debts owing to Sienese up to a sum of 10,000*l.* (*ib.* No. 252), and hand some of these debts over to merchants of the city of Lucca, which then seemed devoted to his cause. (*Ib.* No. 253, but see No. 752.)[1]

The Sienese merchants in England fled, and even those engaged in international commerce on the practically neutral territory of the fairs of Champagne were in constant fear of their goods being seized by the pope and the King of France.[2] The Tolomei (one of the most important firms), in order to protect themselves, resorted to the expedient of warehousing

[1] That some sums were so handed over is clear from the terms of the secret treaty made with Siena after the defeat of Lucca in 1263, whereby the men of Lucca bound themselves to restore to Siena all money taken from her in France, England, or elsewhere by the pope's legate, or by the commune or merchants of Lucca, the amount to be fixed by the *vicarius*. Documents of October 8, 1264, and July 20, 1265, in *Caleffo vecchio* 462 b, 465 in F.T. Perrens's *Hist. de Flor.* IV. i. (1877) ii. 12.

[2] Paoli and Piccolomini, *Lettere volgari del secolo XIII.* (1871), p. 47.

their goods and taking out their commercial papers in the names of partners who were citizens of Parma (*i nostri Parmigiani*) whom they had associated with themselves for the emergency,[1] and doing any business in England by an envoy who was a citizen of Parma.[2]

The strict ties that at this period bound Henry to the pope had resulted in the excommunication having great effect in England, and certain Florentine merchants hastened to make submission to the Holy See and renounce all dealings with Manfred,[3] promising to boycott in the severest way all those who should not return to the obedience of the Church, even though they were their own partners or servants, In return they were freed from every debt or obligation to the *indevoti.* Some Sienese merchants quickly followed their example,[4] and both cities are again represented in England in the following years. It is not necessary to follow the details of these difficulties, which affected Siena far more than Florence, and eventually had much to do with the removal of the former city from its hegemony of international banking.[5]

[1] Paoli and Piccolomini, *Lettere volgari del secolo XIII.* (1871), p. 35. The fiction is kept up all through the accounts.

[2] In a letter of September 4, 1262, dated at Troyes, Andrea de' Tolomei tells the partners in Siena: 'Guido Toscho [of Parma (*ibid.* p. 55)] had a letter from Messer Aduardo [afterwards Edward I.] of safe conduct to go to England, on the petition of Master Alberto da Parma; and I believe it is sufficient and to be relied on, and that it is good for doing that for which he is gone. God, who is Lord, grant him success, if it please Him! And our Sienese, who were there, have all come thence, and not one of them dares to stay there.' (*Ibid.* p. 41.)

[3] See the formalities, and the bond 'by oath and a penalty of two thousand marks sterling,' in G. Arias' *Studi e documenti di storia del diritto* (1901), 114 *sq.*; also his *Trattati commerciali*, I. (1901) pp. 77–80.

[4] See *ante*, p. 210, note 7. By letter of February 11, 1263, Urban IV. commended to Eleanor, Queen of England, Mino Cristofori, Federigo Doni, Andrea Cristofori, Tengo Uguiccioni, and Iacopo Co . . ., partners in England of Pietro and Andrea Cristofori, Guglielmo, Meo Rinaldi, Federigo, and Stricca Rinaldi, of Siena, who had reconciled themselves with the Holy See. (Paoli and Piccolomini, *Lettere volgari del secolo XIII.* (1871), pp. 104–5.)

[5] On February 12, 1268, Clement IV. (*Regesta* i. 193 in *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, *Epist.* Sec. XIII. iii. (1894) 693) informs the *universitas Guelforum Senensium* that he has excommunicated the Ghibellines of Siena—with power to seize their

It is impossible, in the space at my disposal, to describe the second great source of wealth of Italian merchants in England, that commerce in wool in which they displaced the Flemings, and, by their business aptitude and command of cash, obtained at the end of the thirteenth century the virtual monopoly of the staple commodity of the country. England, in more senses than one, provided 'fat pastures' for the moneyed Italians; and, as their wealth increased, they earned the hatred and fear of all Englishmen. So that, when they overstepped the bounds of prudence (as did the Frescobaldi), or through dissensions in their partnership and calling in of papal deposits they became unable to carry on their business (as did the Bonsignori and the Ricciardi), and consequently were obliged to flee the realm, all honest men rejoiced in the punishment that had befallen their oppressors.

It has been pointed out by my immediate precursor in these studies that, dry though the details are, they relate to 'the fellow-countrymen and contemporaries of Dante.' He might have gone further, and said that whoever thoroughly investigates the question will increase his knowledge of most of the great characters of the Divine Comedy. He will need to probe the motives of the popes whose vices and foibles the greatest of Florentines has lashed, of Philip le Bel, whom he hated with a perfect hatred, and of Charles of Anjou, whom he charged with the death of St. Thomas Aquinas. The student will find that the former, when he brought

> duol . . . sopra Senna
> . . . falseggiando la moneta,[1]

did so in spite of the strenuous opposition of his Florentine financiers. He will also see the effect on this country of that

persons and goods in England, France, and elsewhere, on account of their support of Conradino against Charles of Anjou. Similar documents recur down to the time of Gregory X., *e.g.* June 2, 1272, in *Reg. Greg. X.* 60 b.

[1] *Paradiso*, xix. 118–19.

gente nuova that had defiled (in Cacciaguida's words) the 'ovil' di San Giovanni:'[1]

ch' è or mista
Di Campi, di Certaldo, e di Figghine;[2]

and trace the hand of 'Mouche' and 'Biche' in England as well as in France. And in the Public Record Office he will find evidence of the business methods of the sons of that Giovanni Buiamonte, the great Florentine usurer, whom his fellow-townsmen in the seventh circle of hell insisted on calling for with shouts:

Venga il cavalier sovrano
Chi recherà la tasca con tre becchi[3]—

to the great annoyance of the less important usurer who had to bear them company, Reginaldo Scrovigni, of Padua.

It seemed convenient to carry the present paper on to the final collapse of the Ricciardi, the first of the three great groups of Italian 'merchants,' who in turn controlled the finances of England under the first three Edwards. I hope elsewhere to relate in some detail the history of their rise and fall; but may note here that though the reprisals of Philip le Bel for their support of Edward I. produced a suspension of payment, and the arrest of the merchants and their goods in 1296, some members of the firm still remained in England and carried on a small business, making strenuous efforts to save something from the wreck of their fortunes.

With the exception of a small loan made in 1305 to the Prince of Wales, the last transaction of any member of the family that I have found evidenced in English documents is a bond of September 8, 1302 (*Anc. Deeds*, A. 9746); and at that period, accordingly, I close this general discussion of the status and financial methods of the Italian bankers in England in the thirteenth century.

[1] *Paradiso*, xvi. 25. [2] *Ibid.* 49, 50. [3] *Inferno*, xvii. 72–3.

APPENDIX A.

Record Bibliography, and Investigation as to Interest, &c.

The Patent Rolls [1] and Close Rolls [2] give an immense amount of information as to loans by Italians, and this is supplemented by the Liberate Rolls of the Chancery [3] and of the Exchequer of Receipt.[4]

The above-mentioned sources (being all that had previously been explored for the purpose) throw hardly any light on the important question of the nature or amount of remuneration paid to the bankers for their services.

An entry, for example, on the Patent Roll will show the king requesting a particular merchant to lend him a certain sum. An acknowledgment of that sum will next be found, with a promise for its repayment at a date named. At or about such date we accordingly find the enrolment of a writ of *liberate* directing the payment; and on the Memoranda Roll of the Issues of the Exchequer [5] we find that the same sum was paid a few days or weeks later.

It is obvious that some of these entries would be perfectly accurate, and that none would result in error in the accounts, even if on the first payment a deduction had been made by the merchant of a sum for premium or agreed interest in advance, after the habit of money-lenders in all ages.[6] And of course the accounts which the merchants from time to time rendered in the exchequer of their

[1] Now published in full up to 1232, and in Calendar 1272 onward. There is also a very bare MS. Calendar for the whole reign of Henry III. in the P. R. O.

[2] Now published in full up to 1231, and in Calendar from 1272 to 1288.

[3] Printed from 2–5 John. In MS., with considerable breaks, from 1226 to 1263, and thenceforward practically continuous.

[4] These commence April 30, 1226, and are much less perfect than the Chancery Rolls. The last complete entry is dated October 16, 1305 (No. 85). The earliest enrolment of such writs is on the dorse of Receipt Roll (Pells) No. 2*a* for Easter term 1220. Those for Easter terms 1221, 1222, and 1224 are endorsed on Receipt Rolls (Auditors) Nos. 1, 13, and 3 respectively. None of these are enrolled in the Chancery series.

[5] It is to be noted that the Memoranda (being of the nature of drafts) have been carelessly kept. The total number is now comparatively small.

[6] See, *e.g.*, Mr. Round's note to the charter of William of Tottenham in *Ancient Charters of the Twelfth Century* (Pipe Roll Soc.), p. 82.

receipts and payments [1] only showed the sums they were entitled to demand by the terms of their advances. To ascertain the facts, the natural course was to look for the sums so lent in the appropriate Receipt Rolls, in which the treasurer and chamberlains of the exchequer would certainly not charge themselves with any sum that they had not actually received. No trace of such a deduction is to be found.

Careful examination shows no advances by Italians there enrolled before the prest of Michaelmas 1294–5.[2] The sums advanced at that time and in the two following years by Italian merchants were in May 1298 consolidated with a sum of 10,000*l.*, which a syndicate of bankers (headed by Restorio Bonaventura and his partners of the Spini) contracted to pay into the exchequer by three instalments; and the total sum of 28,966*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* was charged on the custom of wool, woolfells, and hides in all parts of England.[3]

The fact that the sums with which the treasurer and chamberlains charge themselves are identical with the sums the repayment of which is charged on the customs proves conclusively that no premium was charged on this loan.

[1] Some of which are entered on the Pipe Roll (see *List of Foreign Accounts*), and others are preserved among the accounts of the King's Remembrancer, and listed under the heading 'Foreign Merchants.'

[2] The Receipt Roll (Pells) No. 87 includes 'Receipts from moneys advanced to the king, as well of moneys arising from the scrutiny made throughout England, as of moneys received from divers merchants of advance granted to the king,' amounting in the whole to 14,715*l.* 4*s.* 10*d.*, 'beside the old money.' Italian merchants gave no less than 14,312*l.* of this sum.

Similar 'advances' from the Ammanati of Pistoia (who had not contributed in the previous year) were received on August 30 (300*l.*) and September 5 (200*l.*) in 1295; on October 19, 1295, four societies who had already made advances gave an additional 500 marks each; and the 'advance made to the king,' February 13, 1297, includes 2,972*l.* (out of a total of 6,000*l.*) from Italian merchants.

[3] *Memoranda Roll* (K.R.), Easter, 26 Edw. I., membs. 99–101, printed in parts by J. Stevenson in *Documents illustrating the History of Scotland* (1870), ii. 278, and by Bond in *Archæologia*, xxviii. 284–290. See above, p. 186, note 2. 'Afterwards, the aforesaid debts having been recited before the king and his council at St. Albans, the king, by the assent and will of the merchants of the societies aforesaid, granted and assigned, for himself and his heirs to the merchants and their partners, all issues arising from the custom of wools, &c., in all parts of England to be received until they have satisfaction of the debts aforesaid.'

Villano Stoldi (father of the historian Giovanni Villani) was given the charge of the customs of Bristol and Ipswich on behalf of the society of the Cerchi Neri, with whom he was then a partner.

Before this prest all sums received from Italian merchants had been paid into the wardrobe, out of which the whole of the king's military expenses were paid, as well as the cost of the maintenance of his household.

It is in the financing of the Welsh war of 1282–3 that I find the only figures that suggest the payment of premiums. A comparison of the account of receipts of the Great Wardrobe from November 20, 1281, to the same date in 1283,[1] with the acknowledgments dated April 14[2] and July 9,[3] 1282, and June 20, 1283,[4] shows that while all but three of the lenders only received the King's promise of repayment for the exact sums paid into the Wardrobe, the Bardi were granted three bonds, amounting to 2,000*l.*, and only paid in 1,166*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*; the society of John de Sanliz and William Servat had bonds for 450*l.* and paid 400*l.*, and the society of William Johannis and John Donedeu had bonds for 100*l.* and 333*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.*, and paid 333*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* As regards the first of these sums, the premium shown by the figures is so utterly unreasonable[5] that we are justified in assuming that the Ricciardi, who had charge of the loan, did not succeed in placing with the Bardi one of the bonds for 1,000 marks with which they had been entrusted. The extent of the king's obligations being thus reduced to 1,333*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.*, the rate of the Bardi's premium works out at 9*l.* 1*s.* 10*d.* per cent. A similar explanation may be suggested as to the firm of Johannis and Donedeu of Cahors, who may not have taken up the bond for 100*l.* issued in April 1282; but I can only account for the premium of 12*l.* 10*s.* 0*d.* per cent. obtained by the other Caorsin firm of Sanliz and Servat by saying that they were very good men of business and not likely to give anything for nothing.[6]

APPENDIX B. (See p. 188)

The 'mercatores' of Rome, and branches from the banking firms of other cities, did a large and flourishing business in lending money to the ecclesiastics who came from distant countries to the

[1] *Accounts*, &c., Exch. (K. R.), bundle 351, No. 4.
[2] *Rot. Walliæ*, 10 Edw. I. m. 9.
[3] *Ibid.* m. 5.
[4] *Rot. Walliæ*, 11 Edw. I. m. 1.
[5] It works out at 71*l.* 8*s.* 7*d.* per cent.; the rate of the Jews in 1179 had been only 43*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* per cent.
[6] See *Law Quarterly Review*, xix. 6–8, and Close Roll 19 Edw. I. 9d., 8d.

Holy See, and especially to those who appealed to Rome in questions of law or of patronage, and those who came for investiture and needed money in order to pay their first-fruits and other dues.

Loans were made to them, with the sanction of the Curia,[1] and the terms were under its control. At a later period a special commission had to be created to regulate and authorise such loans.[2] The security consisted not only in the personal guarantee of the borrower and a charge on his own goods, ecclesiastical and worldly, but also (in most cases) in a charge on his church (or convent) and on his successors for ever. Being made before an ecclesiastical tribunal, such recognizances were enforceable by ecclesiastical sanctions—excommunication, interdict, and the like; and the papal *Regesta* abound in documents showing the energy with which the merchants pressed their claims, and the shifts by which the unfortunate borrowers and their successors tried to evade liability.

Here, however, I can deal with only one or two early cases that concern this country.

The first of such loans that I have found mentioned is referred to in a bull (dated January 25, 1177, in *Registrum Malmesburiense* (Rolls) i. 374 = Jaffé 12787) whereby Alexander IV. remits to the judgment of the bishops of London and Worcester a dispute between Malmesbury abbey and certain 'merchants that frequent the Curia' who claimed the payment of moneys which (as they asserted) they had lent on the security of the convent to certain brethren thereof. The abbot and brethren 'constantly assert that those of the brethren whom the merchants allege to have received the loan neither had letters of the convent, nor received any loan by their consent.'

A really important historical crisis is the occasion of the second of such loans. Here, again, we have no details, and only the word of a rhetorical letter-writer for the *extent* of the borrowing.

Peter de Blois and Gerard la Pucelle were sent to Rome in 1177 by King Richard to oppose the benediction of Roger, abbot elect of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, and remained there till July 1178, making vain efforts to maintain the prerogatives of the see of Canterbury 'for which' (Peter wrote) 'the blessed Thomas had

[1] A late instance is in *Regesta*, xxii. 254 d, when Innocent IV. granted to John and Alexander, brethren and proctors of the Order of Sempringham, faculty to contract a loan of 1,000*l.* to meet their expenses incurred at the apostolic see (March 18, 1253, in Bliss, *Cal. Papal Lett.* p. 284).

[2] See G. Schneider, *Die finanziellen Beziehungen der florentinischen Bankiers zur Kirche* (1889), ch. v.

been ready to pour out his brains,' against the papal claim that the abbacy was held directly of the Holy See. In a letter to John, bishop of Chartres,[1] Peter describes Roger's arrival: 'bene siquidem receptus ab eis qui, sicut scitis, gratius acceptant hominum munera quam merita personarum.' Roger, he says, was 'a man illiterate and lay, but circumspect in the buying of honours, who had acquired the abbacy with simoniac venality, not secretly but publicly and as in a market-place.' Him Peter accused of manifest and notorious offences, but 'those whom he had made his friends with the mammon of unrighteousness poured oil and wine into the wounds of his infamy.' 'Exhaustis itaque Flandriæ mercatoribus in argento, a Romanis tandem infinitam multitudinem auri mutuavit.'[2] Peter of Blois was again in Rome in March, 1179, attending the Lateran Council, in the suite of the archbishop of Canterbury. On his previous errand he had nothing but his native eloquence[3] to set against the abbot elect. Now he found himself unprovided with funds, and was obliged to apply to one Master Stephen, apparently an Italian cleric, who became surety for him to certain Bolognese merchants in respect of fifteen marks of common and lawful sterlings. Peter failed to pay,[4] and Stephen suffered many

[1] Ep. clviii. in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* ccviii. 453.

[2] As Roger was fighting the battle of the papacy even more than his own, the loans were doubtless raised on the guarantee of the Curia. An abbot elect whose right even to the spirituals of his abbacy was disputed could not offer a security over the temporals satisfactory to any prudent money-lender. There seems to be no reference to expenses of this sort in the *Chronicle of St. Augustine's* or in the *Epp. Cantuar.* that deal with the contest and subsequent events. Richard was ardently interested on the archbishop's side, and was even reported ready to renounce his allegiance to the pope if his wishes were not complied with; and if there had been any chance of claims being made upon lands or persons within his realm, he would not have failed to throw a most effective obstacle in Roger's path by a denunciation such as his brother issued in the case of the abbot of Séez:—

'Dilectis suis Romæ Tusciæ Italiæ mercatoribus. Denunciamus vobis ne Priori de Sagien' et sociis suis aliquam pecuniam credatis super litteras capituli sui. Ille enim et quidam complices sui contra nos et dignitatem nostram laborant. Sciatis enim, quod si quam pecuniam illis crederitis de pecunia terræ nostræ non reddetur.' March 30, 1202, in *Pat. Roll* 3 John m. 3, in *Rot. Litt. Pat.* (1835) 8.

See a similar letter of Henry III. as to Benedict of Winchester in 1242, *Rôles Gascons*, No. 1207.

[3] 'Ad nativæ rationis argumenta me contuli, fecique sine promissione aliqua, sine donorum aliquorum impendio, quod benedictio elongata est ab eo.' (*Ep.* clviii.)

[4] He seems to have acquired the habit of expecting his friends to become re-

annoyances from the creditors, whose debt, after some years' delay, was very greatly increased. Lucius III. accordingly wrote to the archbishop,[1] directing him, on proof of the facts, to compel the debtor by ecclesiastical censure at once to release Stephen from his guarantee. In spite of the custom that clerics should not be subject to the *juramentum calumniæ* (a custom which the pope denounces as contrary to law), Peter is to give security that he will go or send a representative to Bologna to hear the evidence against him, and the judges of Bologna will transmit the evidence to the archbishop. Should Peter, after citation, neglect to come to the archbishop's presence or to stand his trial, he is to be deprived of his benefice, and his income applied in payment of the debts until satisfaction has been made to the creditors.

A somewhat similar case, in which Robert, clerk of St. Albans, had actually paid to the merchants of Bologna two sums of six and seven marks for which he had become surety for Elias and Philip, clerks of London, is dealt with in a letter of Lucius III. of December 8, 1181, which forms the previous chapter of the same title.[2] If the debtors fail to indemnify Robert, 'the debts are to be raised out of their revenues, and likewise the damages which Robert has suffered are to be made good, or the revenues assigned to him to be held . . . until the damages and debts are paid. Moreover, if the clerks are proved to have violated the bond (*religionem*) of their faith and oath,[3] they are to be unappealably suspended from office.'

sponsible for his debts: see his letter (*Ep.* clvi.) to Geoffrey Ridel, bishop of Ely. 'Drawn by most urgent necessity, I go to Canterbury to be crucified by perfidious Jews, who torture and afflict me on the grievous gibbet of debtors. The same cross I expect in London unless in mercy you deliver me from it—you with whom is mercy and plenteous redemption. Take away, father and dearest friend, this cross from me, and take upon yourself six pounds, which I owe to Sampson the Jew.'

[1] *Decret. Greg. IX.* lib. iii. tit. xxii. 'De fidejuss.' cap. iii. in *Corpus Jur. Canon.* (ed. Friedberg, 1881) II. 530 = Jaffé 9576.

[2] In Jaffé, No. 9427. The conclusion of the letter is in lib. ii. tit. vii. 'De juramento calumniæ,' c.v.—*C.J.C.* (1881), II. 267.

[3] Elias had promised payment 'on his faith,' and Philip on his oath.

APPENDIX C.—Advances

No.	Envoys, &c.	Letters of			Total Amount
		Dated	No.	Ranging from	
					s. *a.*
1	See below [1]				
2	On a bond of Richard I. . . .	—		—	—
3	See below [2]				
4	Savaric, bishop of Bath and Glastonbury, Hugh, abbot of Abingdon, Richard, abbot of Michelney, and John, abbot of Torre	1200, Nov. 28	8	250*l.*–500*l.*	2500 0 0
		—	—	—	—
5	Hugh de Feritate and Robert de Sablence	1201, Jan. 6	1	—	333 6 8
6	J. d'Alençon and Master Ralph de Furnes	1202, Jan. 21	1	—	33 6 8
7	Hubert, archdeacon of Hiemes and Master Robert de Arenis	1202, April 17	4	50 *m.*–100 *m.*	200 0 0
8	J., bishop elect of Bernac . .	1202, May 16	6	60 *m.*–100 *m.*	373 6 8
9	R., prior of Dunstable and Master R. Peccator	1203, Feb. 26	4	40 *m.*–100 *m.*	226 13 4
10	Aufrid de Dene and Thomas de Erdinton	1206, May 26	5	500 *m.*–1000 *m.*	2000 0 0
11	H., abbot of Beaulieu . . .	1206, Aug. 25	1	—	26 13 4
12	Master Raun' de Turribus . .	1206, Nov. 8	1	—	20 0 0
13	Envoys named in Nos. 10 and 11 .	1207, Feb. 20	4	—	1333 6 8
14	Thomas de Erdinton and Emeric de Saceye	1214, Jan. 3	1	—	100 0 0
15	H., abbot of Beaulieu . . .	1215, Jan. 8	1	—	66 13 4
16	Henry de Londres, archbishop of Dublin	1215, Sept. 14	3	500 *m.*–1000 *m.*	1333 6 8
17	Master Philip de Hadham . .	1218, Mar. 21	1	—	13 6 8
18	Master Geoffrey de Calceto, brother R., monk of Abingdon, Ralph, bishop of Chichester, and Peter Sarracenus, citizen of Rome	1218, Nov. 6	1	—	4000 0 0

[1] Bond of August 25, 1199, for 1417*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* in favour of Sperone Bagorotoni and his partners of Piacenza, in respect of loan to William of Anjou, Robert de Shrewsbury, bishop of Bangor, and Stephen de Ridel, in the business of Otho, king of the Romans, at the request of Richard I.—*Charter Roll*, 1 John, 21 d. By a writ dated at Rouen, July 3, 1203 (*Liberate Roll*, 5 John, m. 11; ed. 1844, p. 146), the king ordered Geoffrey Fitz Peter and his companions to pay out of the first moneys which should reach the exchequer, or out of any money actually there, 200*l.* to

IN THE COURT OF ROME

CREDIT		LIBERATE				
Reference	Amount not cashed	Dated	Amount	In whose favour	City	Reference
	£ s. d.		£ s. d.			
—	—	1219, Nov. 8	100 0 0	Piero Guibertini, Giovanni di Sarra, Ugolino di Messer Albericci, Giovanni di Paolo di Plebano, Giuliano Arardi, and Radolfo	Bologna	Exch., Treas. of Rec., Warr. for Issues, No. 964, *ante*, p. 193
Rot. Chart. 99	2000 0 0					
—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rot. Pat. (1825), 4*b*[3]	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ibid. 5	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ibid. 9	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ibid. 10*b*	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ibid. 26	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ibid. 65*b*. See also *Ibid.* 69	650 0 0	—	—	—	—	—
Ibid. 67	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ibid. 68*b*	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ibid. 69	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rot. Pat. 107*b*	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ibid. 126*b*	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ibid. 182[4]	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pat. 2 Hen. III. m. 4	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pat. 3 Hen. III. m. 6	—	—	—	—	—	—

Hubert Walters, archbishop of Canterbury, to be repaid by him to merchants of Piacenza, from whom he had borrowed it in behalf of King Otho.

[2] Bond of June 5, 1200, for 666*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* in favour of Sperone Bagorotoni, Isamberto Selvaggi, and Gerardo degli Spaudi of Piacenza : see p. 194.

[3] See also the letters of Ralph, vicomte of Sainte-Susanne, and William de Rupibus, at the same reference.

[4] This authority is addressed to Cardinal S. de Fossa Nova, cardinal of the Basilica of the Twelve Apostles, asking his good offices to procure the loan.

No.	Envoys, &c.	Letters of			
		Dated.	No.	Ranging from	Total Amount
					£. s. d.
19	[Master Geoffrey de Calceto and Master Diodati	1218, Dec. 31	1	—	4000 0 0
20	W. de Verdun and Master Humphrey de Millers	—	—	—	—
21	Master Stephen de Lucy and Godfrey de Craucumbe	1223, Dec. 12	2	100 *m.*–400 *m.*	333 6 8
22	[J., archdeacon of Bedford and Master Alexander de Wauton	1224, Jan. 21	5	100 *m.*–300 *m.*	500 0 0
23	As No. 21	1224, Oct. 26	10	30 *m.*–300 *m.*	673 6 8
24	[Master Philip de Hadham . .	1225, Apr. 22	1	—	13 6 8
25	Masters Stephen de Lucy and Stephen de Eketon	1225, Aug. 16	13	10 *m.*–500 *m.*	1000 0 0
26	Master Henry de Bishopston and Stephen de Strand	1226, Feb. 15	3	20 *m.*–50 *m.*	70 0 0
27	Master Philip de Hadham . .	—	—	—	—
28	Alexander, bishop of Coventry .	1226, Sept. 16	8	40 *m.*–60 *m.*	266 13 4
29	Master Philip de Ardern [? Hadham] and Peter Grimbaldi	1226, Nov. 30	3	30 *m.*–40 *m.*	66 13 4
30	[Alexander, bishop of Coventry, and the prior of Lenton	1227, Jan. 19	10	0 *m.*–100 *m.*	333 6 8
31	Alexander de Swereford, archdeacon of Salop, and Master William de Cantelupe	1227, Oct. 20	13	20 *m.*–500 *m.*	666 13 4

CREDIT		LIBERATE				
Reference	Amount not cashed	Dated	Amount	In whose favour	City	Reference
	£ s. d.		£ s. d.			
Pat. 3 Hen. III. m. 5, '*No loan effected.*']	4000 0 0	—	—	—	—	—
	—	1221, Nov. 3	22 13 4	Peter Sarracenus	Rome	*Rot. Claus.* I. 477 *b*
Pat. 8 Hen. III. m. 12	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ibid. m. 10, '*Cancelled.*']	500 0 0	—	—	—	—	—
Pat. 8 Hen. III. m. 1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pat. 9 Hen. III. m. 5, '*He had not the money.*']	13 6 8	—	—	—	—	—
Pat. 9 Hen. III. m. 2	16 13 4	—	—	—	—	—
Pat. 10 Hen. III. m. 7	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	1226, July 8	40 0 0	Manerio, Dedi, Guascone, Navello and Cambio	Florence	Rec. Roll. (Pells), No. 2 *b*, m. 1. *dorso*, *Roll. Liberate*, (Exch. of Rec.), No. 1 *dorso* = *Rot. Claus.* II. 128
Ibid. m. 1	—	1227, July 13	266 13 4	Gregorio Palmieri, Reniero Shelebel, for Lionardo Giordani, Lamberto Guardabene, Gualterino Brunetti, Lambertino di , Gentile, Tolomeo Afforsi and Uguiccio Boneventani, their partners, and Bestorio di Guido di Guccio	Siena	*Liberate Roll* (Chanc.), 11 Hen. III. m. 5
Pat. 11 Hen. III. m. 12	46 13 4	1227, July 13	40 0 0			—
Pat. 11 Hen. III. m. 9, '*They had no loan.*']	333 6 8	—	—	—		
Pat. 11 Hen. III. m. 1	400 0 0	1228, May 5	200 0 0	Burgundio Beltarelli, Restoro di Jacopo, Lionardo Ubertini, Jacopo Pieri, &c.	Siena	*Liberate Roll* (Chanc.), 12 Hen. III. m. 6.
		1228, June 24	66 13 4	Reniero Salimbene, for himself and Bonaventura di Pace, Lamberto Guardadei, Ragonese Albertini, Ugolino Gentili, Bartolommeo Cirioli, Buoncompagno Giudice, and Bartolommeo di Mancino, &c.	Siena	*Ibid.* m. 5

No.	Envoys, &c.	Letters of			
		Dated	No.	Ranging from	Total Amount
					£ s. d.
32	Masters Walter de Crespin and William de Grenlawe	1227, Nov. 19	19	30 *m.*–500 *m.*	2000 0 0
33	Masters John Blundo, R. de Shardlawe, and Godfrey de Craucumbe	1228, Sept. 21	14	40 *m.*–500 *m.*	1313 6 8
34	[Luke, archbishop elect of Dublin .	1229, Jan. 26	1	—	133 6 8
35	Master Roger de Cantilupe and Henry de Nafford	1231, Feb. 6	8	50 *m.*–500 *m.*	1000 0 0
36	Peter Sarracenus and Peter Grimbald	1232, April 25	7	100 *m.*–200 *m.*	666 13 4
37	Richard de Sancto Johanne . .	1232, Oct. 25	1	—	66 13 4

CREDIT		LIBERATE				
Reference	Amount not cashed	Dated	Amount	In whose favour	City	Reference
	£ s d		£ s. d.			
Pat. 12 Hen. III. m. 1	993 6 8	1228, June 24	353 6 8	The same, with Montanello Morlandi and Bernardo Alamandi	Siena	*Ibid.*
		1228, May 8	200 0 0	Michael de Banderane and Thomas de Sancto Quintino, for Torco Chiaromontesi, Erminio Bencivenni, Ugolino Benucci, Reniero Orlandi, Piccolomineo Oltramonte, Reniero di Poncio, Alberto di Piero, and Tomasino Ancontini, &c.	Siena	Bond, No. ii.
		1228, July 20	453 6 8	Buoncompagno Giudice, &c.	Siena	*Liberate Roll* (Chanc.), 12 Hen. III. m. 3
Ibid. '*They brought back the letters of credit.*'	1113 6 8	1229, May 16	200 0 0	Bartolommeo Cirioli, Lamberto Guardadei, Guido Sarraceni, Bonaventura di Pace, Ugolino Gentile, Buoncompagno Giudice, Beringerio Guardamoli, and Bartolommeo di Mancino	Siena	*Liberate Roll* (Chanc.), 13 Hen. III. m. 7
Pat. 13 Hen. III. m. 10, '*He took no loan.*']	133 6 8	—	—	—	—	—
Pat. 15 Hen. III. m. 4	433 6 8	—	—	—	—	—
Pat. 16 Hen. III. m. 7	—	1233, May 24	600 0 0	Compagno [degli Antelli ?], &c.	Florence	*Liberate Roll* (Chanc.), 17 Hen. III. m. 6
Ibid. m. 1	—	—	—	—	—	—

APPENDIX D.

[Dipl. Doc., Chancery, No. 10.]

Otto miseratione divina Sancti Nicholai in carcere Tulliano diaconus cardinalis Apostolicæ sedis Legatus Omnibus, *etc.* Sciat universitas vestra quod in nostra presentia constitutus Dominus Henricus dei gratia Rex Anglorum Illustris confessus est et recognovit coram nobis se mutuo recepisse apud Westmonasterium pro negotiis suis et terræ suæ utiliter faciendis a Clario Hugolini, Felino Willelmi, Renuchitio Bonacorsi civibus et mercatoribus Florentinis Sexcentas marcas bonorum novorum et legalium sterlingorum scilicet, *etc.* De qua pecunia se bene vocavit quietum et integre pagatum et exceptioni non numeratæ et non traditæ sibi pecuniæ penitus renuntiavit. Quas pretaxatas sexcentas marcas sterlingorum predicto modo et numero computandas dictus dominus Rex promisit et tenetur per stipulationem legitimam reddere et persolvere dictis mercatoribus aut uni eorum aut eorum certo nuntio infra quindecim dies post proximum futurum festum Sancti Michaelis apud Novum Templum Londoniis cum omnibus pactis et convencionibus sicut in litteris dicti Illustris Regis super dicto mutuo confectis exinde plenius continetur. In cujus rei testimonium presentibus litteris sigillum nostrum fecimus apponi ad instantiam domini Regis et ad instantiam magistri Petri de Aqua Blancha et Johannis de Gadesden' qui similiter in presentia nostra confessi sunt se teneri obligatos eodem modo per omnia dictis mercatoribus pro predictis sexcentis marcis sterlingorum persolvendis dictis mercatoribus loco et termino supradictis nisi dominus Rex satisfaceret secundum quod in instrumentis inde confectis plenius continetur. Datæ Londiniis xiiij die Augusti Pontificatus domini Gregorii papæ noni anno xiiij.

[*Cancelled.*]

APPENDIX E (p. 18).

Edwardus, etc.,[1] Thesaurario et Camerariis suis salutem. Liberate de thesauro nostro Coppe Joseph' Coppe Cottenne et Taldo Janiani mercatoribus de societate Friscombaldorum de Florencia 1,387*l.* 12*s.* sterlingorum pro illis 7,284*l.* 18*s.* Turensium nigrorum in quibus iidem mercatores obligarunt se pro nobis erga quosdam mercatores de Vasconia pro illis 2,312*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* crokardorum in quibus dictis mercatoribus Vasconie tenebamur pro vinis ab ipsis tam per Mathæum de Columbariis quam per Adam de Rokesle ad expensas hospicii nostri tempore dilecti clerici nostri Johannis de Drokenesford custodis garderobæ nostre nuper emptis. Proviso quod predictus Johannes de predictis 2,312*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* crokardorum in compoto suo ad scaccarium predictum prout justum fuerit oneretur. Et recipiatis ab eisdem mercatoribus litteras nostras patentes eis de predictis 1,387*l.* 12*s.* sterlingorum confectas. Teste me ipso [Pontefract, June 8, 1300.][2]

[*Endorsed.*] ¶ Pro Coppe Joseph' et Coppe Cottenn'.

¶ Summa 1,387*l.* 12*s.* De quibus eisdem 62*l.* 11*s.* 2*d.* liberati in j. tallia facta Willelmo de Estaniaco Archidiacono Lincolniensi de fine pro debito mercatorum de Luca 5 die Junii anno regni regis Edwardi 28. Eisdem 6 die Julii 154*l.* in vij. talliis factis Gilberto de Knovill' vicecomiti Devonensi, quarum vj. sunt in magna recepta et j. in finibus religiosorum alienigenorum ut patet in eodem rotulo eodem die. Eidem 21 die Julii, 100*l.* in una tallia facta Abbati de Furneys de fine per preceptum Thesaurarii, nuntio W. de Brithull'. Eidem 23 die Julii, 42*l.* 10*s.* in una tallia facta priori de Byrstal de fine pro taxatione domus suæ per preceptum Thesaurarii, nuntio W. de Brythull'. Eidem in medio tempore 23 die Augusti, 80*l.* in j. tallia facta Abbati de Wynchecumbe de fine pro servicio suo Scociæ per preceptum Thesaurarii. Eidem eodem die, 100 *m.* in j. tallia facta Johanni filio Reginaldi de fine pro servicio suo Scociæ preceptu ejusdem.

[1] *Exchequer of Receipt, Warrants for Issues,* Bundle 1*b.* The writ is printed (with an omission) by Bond in *Archæologia,* xxviii. 291, No. cix.

[2] The Chancery enrolment (*Liberate Roll,* 28 Edw. I. m. 4) adds that the writ was issued 'by the king on the information of John de Drokenesford.'

Eisdem in termino Sancti Michaelis anno Edwardi 28, 40 marcæ in j. tallia facta Thomæ Exoniensi episcopo de fine pro licencia feoffandi Priorem et Conventum de Brienton per preceptum Thesaurarii, 29 die Novembris. Eidem 2 die Decembris, 50*l.* in j. tallia facta Stephano de Morgia et Waltero de la Grave de exitibus prioratus de Lentone per preceptum Thesaurarii. Eisdem 9 die Decembris, 40*l.* in j. tallia facta Willelmo de Welleby de exitibus terrarum que fuerunt Gilberti de Gaunt per preceptum Thesaurarii, nuntio W. de Brithull'. Eisdem 10 die Decembris, 125*l.* 16*d.* in una tallia facta Richardo Oysel Ballivo de Holdernesse de exitibus balliviæ sue per j. litteram Coppe Cotenne patentem receptionem dictæ pecuniæ testificantem.[1]

¶ Eisdem in termino Paschæ anno Edwardi 29, 100*l.* liberatæ Coppe Cottenni in j. tallia facta Willelmo Merree custodi balliviæ de Berchamstede de exitibus ejusdem sicut patet in rotulo magnæ receptæ die Lune 3 die Julii anno predicto per preceptum Thesaurarii et per billam dicti Coppe sigillatam. Eisdem 4 die Julii, 77*l.* in j. tallia facta Thomæ de la Hide senescallo Cornubiæ de exitibus balliviæ sue predicto die per j. litteram Jacobi Janiani mercatoris de societate Friscobaldorum de Florencia attornati Coppe Cottenn' per litteras ejusdem Coppe patentes per quas assignavit dictum Jacobum ad recipiendum nomine suo et sociorum suorum dictam pecuniam de dicto Thoma per preceptum Thesaurarii. Eisdem 13 die Julii, 119*l.* 15*s.* 5*d.* liberati eisdem per manus Henrici de Cobeham vicecomitis Kanciæ in quinque talliis sibi factis per preceptum P[hilippi] de Wyllugby tenentis locum thesaurarii et Baronum de Scaccario, quarum quatuor sunt in rotulo magnæ receptæ predicto die et continent 79*l.* 15*s.* 5*d.* et quinta in rotulo religiosorum et continet 40*l.* Eisdem 14 die Augusti, 100*l.* liberate Coppe Cottenn' in una tallia facta eodem die Waltero de Ayllesburia custodi castri et Honoris Walingfordiæ de exitibus balliviæ suæ per preceptum Thesaurarii, nuncio W. de Brithull'.

Eisdem in termino Sancti Michaelis anno 31, 171*l.* 14*s.* 1½*d.* liberati eisdem per manus Coppe Cottenn' et per litteram ejusdem in j. tallia facta Ricardo Oysel ballivo de Holdernesse de exitibus balliviæ suæ die Lune 2 die Decembris per preceptum P[hilippi] de Wyllugby tenentis locum thesaurarii, nuntio W. de Brithull'.[2]

[1] At this point the dorse of the writ is filled. What follows is on a slip of parchment stitched to it.

[2] As a further illustration of the labour involved in thirteenth-century accountancy, it seems worth while to print the entries in the rolls of the Exchequer of

Eisdem in termino Paschæ anno regni regis Edwardi filii regis Edwardi secundo, 71*l.* 13*s.* 3½*d.* liberati eisdem 20 die Junii anno predicto in una tallia facta mercatoribus de Societate Friscobaldorum de Florencia pro collectoribus veteris et novæ custumæ lanarum in Anglia de exitibus ejusdem custumæ continente 429*l.* 13*s.* 6½*d.* sicut continetur in rotulo magnæ receptæ anno eodem.

Et persolvitur breve.

Receipt relating to this transaction. These are both dated December 2, and run as follows :

'*Ebor.* De Ricardo Oysel Ballivo de Holdernesse c. lxxj. li. xiv. s. j d. ō. de exitibus balliviæ suæ. } Coppe'

Receipt Roll (Pells) Mich. 31 & 32 Edw. I.

'Coppe Joseph' Coppe Cottenn' et Taldo Janiani mercatoribus de societate Friscobaldorum de Florencia super breve suum de liberate continens M. ccc. lxxxvij. li. xij. s. cujus data est apud Pontem fractum viij die Junii anno regni regis Edwardi xxviij, c. lxxj. li. xiv. s. j. d. ob. Liberati eisdem secundo die Decembris per manus dicti Coppe Cottenn'. Unde littera ejusdem remanet penes Cameram recepcionem dictorum denariorum testificans. In j. tallia facta Ricardo Oysel Ballivo de Holdernesse de exitibus balliviæ per preceptum P[hilippi] de Wyllughby tenentis locum Thesaurarii nuncio W. de Brithull'.'

Issue Roll (Pells) Mich. 31 & 32 Edw. I.

BONDMEN UNDER THE TUDORS

By ALEXANDER SAVINE.

Read January 15th, 1903.

In the Domesday Survey *villani*, *bordarii*, *cotarii*, and *servi* included the great majority of the rural and also of the whole population. The intermixture of these classes created the apparently homogeneous mass of the villeins of the feudal age. No one has ever tried to work out for statistical purposes the rich store of information concerning the subdivision of these classes that is accumulated in the manorial records and in the State surveys of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. But the best modern authorities convey the impression that villeins holding in villeinage were typical of the feudal village and formed the bulk of the rural population.

The twelfth and thirteenth centuries were a period of comparative social stability, followed, as it is generally supposed, by the great and rapid changes in the second half of the fourteenth century. The Tudor age is considered to be another period of transformation in the fabric of society, and when we come to the first Stuart the very last of the 'bondmen,' as they are called now, vanishes before our eyes.

The question naturally arises, When did the bulk of this the most numerous and perhaps the most important class of mediæval society cease to exist?

We have many opinions and few facts about the later villeinage. To begin with modern writers; Prof. Thorold Rogers believed that the epidemics of the fourteenth century and the great peasants' rebellion practically destroyed personal serfdom. Already in the fifteenth century the villeins are

very few, and for these few their serfdom is little more than a legal fiction. Whatever its value be, this opinion has at least the merit of clearness and logical consequence. The views of another authority are less pronounced, but he has clearly shown that the rebellion of 1381 was not followed by the immediate and complete disappearance of serfdom, as Rogers erroneously affirmed. We have to look at the sixteenth century for this result.[1]

Mr. Leadam, in his interesting article on 'The Last Days of Bondage in England,'[2] places the final disappearance of serfdom under Elizabeth's reign. He ascribes this fact to the psychological influence of Protestantism, hostile to bondage; to the Dissolution, which revealed the existence of bondmen in great numbers upon the ecclesiastical lands; and to the conversions from arable to pasture, which dispensed with labour services. He states that real statistics of Tudor bondage are impossible because our evidence is too sparse and scanty. He considers the rights of the lord over his bondman to have been as real under the Tudors as in the time of Bracton; but he makes an important exception for the 'customary' land in the possession of the bondman, assuming that such lands were guaranteed to the bondman by the law courts.

Of late two further writers have expressed their views on the general economic and social significance of the Tudor villeinage. Mr. Cheyney's article contains[3] little fresh information. His views are those of Rogers. He holds that already in the fifteenth century serfdom is to be regarded as a dead thing, while in the history of the inclosure movement (1450–1550) questions of tenure only, not of personal servitude, arise. The bondman is a rarity, villeinage is only a shadowy survival. Thus the Glastonbury case is regarded as an exception, for the western part of England had always been the special home of servitude. Mr. Cheyney's perception of the importance of tracing the causes of the decay of villeinage is

[1] Cunningham, *History of Industry and Commerce*, i. 376, 402–3, 533; ii. 90.

[2] *L.Q.R.* ix. 348 65.

[3] *E.H.R* xv. 20–37.

excellent, but he hardly brings us much nearer to the solution of the problem. His chief inference is that the voluntary manumissions, the flights of the villeins, the attitude of the law courts in favour of liberty, explain very little in the decay of serfdom, as these agencies caused the emancipation of occasional persons, not of a whole class. The real causes of the decay of serfdom he believes to lie in the commutation of the labour services and the development of land leases. The inference is not new, but Mr. Cheyney does not discriminate between the legal forms and the underlying economic and moral causes of the disappearance of serfdom. Manumissions, flights, or, to use a technical term, the non-user of the seignorial rights and prescription on the part of the villein, and the decisions of the law courts are legal forms, and the only legal forms which carried freedom to the bondman. All bondmen who became free attained their liberty either by manumission or by non-user of seignorial rights (for the most part as a consequence of living for a long time outside the manor) or by legal decision. No other means were possible. This does not mean that these legal forms were the causes of emancipation. Certainly the causes lie in the contemporaneous economic and social changes, but the latter must be investigated and not put forward by way of dogmatic assertion.

Dr. Page in his two important essays [1] has attempted such an investigation of the commutation of labour services, and thus has cleared the way for the explanation of the decay of serfdom. But the bulk of his evidence is confined to the fourteenth century and the first half of the fifteenth, and he is interested much more in the history of villein tenure than in that of villein status. His instructive exposition of the progress of the commutation does not go further than 1455 : he has shown conclusively that in the manors which he has studied little remained of the old labour services at this date ;

[1] *Umwandlung der Frohndienste in Geldrenten*, Baltimore, 1897 ; *End of Villeinage in England*, 1900, Public. of American Econ. Association. Cf. Dr. Vinogradoff's review of the latter work in *E.H.R.* xv. 774–81.

the economic conditions of villein tenure had given way to the new state of things. He is fully aware that the extinction of villein tenure does not mean the extinction of personal serfdom. He knows, for instance, that the Court Rolls of the sixteenth century continued to record the names of the bondmen who dwelt outside the manor. But he is inclined to consider the villeinage of the Tudor period as little more than a legal fiction, interesting perhaps to an antiquary, but unimportant to the student of economic history.[1] Dr. Page affirms that when the Court of Requests was established to protect the villeins, villeinage had perished, and there were few villeins left to protect. But what are the proofs of this assertion? He says he could not find for the sixteenth century any cases either of recapture of fled villeins or of the arbitrary seizure by the lord of the villein's property. But he gives no quotations, and we cannot form any judgment of the quantity and quality of his evidence. Apart from this the rights of the lord over the villeins are not confined to arbitrary seizure of their property and to their recapture in case of flight. A study of the later villeinage cannot omit such incidents of the status as 'merchet,' 'chevage,' and payments for manumission.

After all, we obtain more information on the subject from a few monographs dealing with particular manors of the Tudor age, especially Miss Davenport's valuable essay on Forncett.[2] But these would require a special examination.

I do not mean that the general assertions of the modern authors are purely arbitrary—far from it. My view is only that they are perhaps based much more on the personal opinions of old authors than on the study of pleas, surveys, court rolls, and manumissions. Therefore before we come to the documentary evidence it may be interesting to recall the views of the most eminent writers of the Tudor period.[3]

[1] *End of Villeinage*, p. 99.

[2] *Trans. Roy. Hist. Soc.* xiv. 123-41, 'Decay of Villeinage in East Anglia.'

[3] The passages that follow are mostly very well known. I apologise for repeating these old things, but it is necessary to put them together and to mark the differences between various authors.

Harrison is, as far as I know, the only author who utterly denies the existence of bondmen in his own time. But the passage sounds like the patriotic preaching of a Tudor parson. As for slaves and bondmen (he tells us) we have none; nay, such is the privilege of our country by the 'especial grace of God and bounty of our princes, that if any come hither from other realms, so soon as they set foot on land they become as free in condition as their masters.'[1] What are these 'slaves,' and when did bondage disappear from the English soil? Harrison does not speak clearly of the past. Probably his meaning is that slavery was never known in the glorious country of freedom, and that English villeinage is something different from slavery as the latter exists in lands not favoured by the 'especial grace of God.' But clearly the passage is of very little value.

Sir Thomas Smith is the author of the best known view as to the end of villeinage. In the 'Commonwealth of England'[2] he compares the English law with the civil law and finds that the Romans knew two kinds of bondmen, *servi* and *adscripticii glebæ* or *agricensiti*. The first correspond to the villeins in gross, the second to the villeins regardant. Neither of the one sort nor of the other have we any number in England. And of the first 'I never knewe any in the realme in my time: of the seconde so fewe there be, that it is not almost worthe the speaking.' He attributes the mitigation of the cruel Roman law in France and England, and the eventual disappearance of bondmen in England, to the humanising influence of Christianity. The holy fathers never ceased preaching manumission, and the laity were glad to obey by reason of terror in their conscience, 'specially in their extreme and deadly sicknesses.' It is noteworthy that Sir Thomas Smith, a lawyer himself, thought that villeinage was extinct by the legal process of manumission, chiefly manumission by will. However, he reproaches the clergy with the fact that they were the last to manumit their own

[1] *Description of England*, ii., 5th ed. New Shak. Soc. 1877.
[2] *De Republica Anglorum*, iii., ch. viii., pp. 107–13, ed. 1583.

bondmen. But it was the Dissolution that struck the last blow at villeinage. When the monastic lands came into lay hands the last villeins received their manumission. The bishops (but not all) freed theirs also in recent times, 'partly for argent . . . to make a peece of money . . . partly for slaunders that they seemed more cruell than the temporaltie.' Thus the view of Sir Thomas Smith is that in the beginning of the Tudor period the bondmen, very rare on the lay estates, still lingered in considerable numbers on the Church lands, at least until the Dissolution. Perhaps I may mention another point. Mr. Pollard has of late drawn attention to the fact that Smith's book, something like Fortescue's work a century before, was written largely in France, and was influenced by a desire to extol the English over the French constitution.[1] Is it possible that the author's patriotic tendency could have biassed his appreciation of the English villeinage?

It seems to me that as general pictures of contemporary social conditions the statements of Fitzherbert and Norden must be preferred to those of Harrison and Sir Thomas Smith. I do not know which Fitzherbert was the author of 'Surveyinge.' If it was Sir Anthony he ought to have been well acquainted with the condition of bondmen over the whole kingdom. If it was the elder brother, John, it is probable that from personal experience he speaks only of his own locality, that is to say, of the inland counties, though he affects to know the local agricultural conditions of Cheshire and Lancashire. As everybody knows, he deplores the fact that in his own day (the first edition appeared in 1523), in spite of many manumissions, 'in some places the boundmen contynue as yet.' And he makes the remarkable addition that in some places the number of bondmen was even on the increase; that freemen were becoming bond and were treated as such by the unscrupulous lords. 'There be many freemen taken as bondmen, and their landes and goodes taken from

[1] *Dict. Nat. Biogr.* and *England under Protector Somerset* (1900), p. 75, note.

them, so that they shall not be able to sue for remedy, to prove themselfe fre of blode. And that the freemen have the same name as the bondemen, or that his auncestors was manumysed before hys byrthe.'[1] The last words have a savour of reality, and they present a view very different from the pleasing picture of pious laymen manumitting their villeins under religious influences.

Almost a century after the appearance of 'Surveyinge' in some places it is possible to meet with or rather to detect bondmen after an attentive study of manorial records. I lay especial stress on Norden's authority because he speaks from exceptionally large personal experience. In 1607 (the date of the first edition) a lord has a talk with a surveyor on the things incident to a manor. Certainly the lord does not know anything about these things, but the surveyor does.

Lord: What else is to be considered, touching the things incident to a manor?

Surveyor: Nothing, sir; but a matter *almost out of use*, a tenure called villeinage.

Lord: But I thinke there be not many under this kinde of servitude at this day?

Surveyor: There are not. . . . Although (no doubt) there are yet some within this Realme without manumission, *fewe knowne, but more concealed*.[2]

And Norden repeats the statement in another place. The nineteenth article of his form of the survey is, 'Whether is there within the manor any villaine or niefe, namely any bondman or bondwoman: if there be, what are their names, what land do they hold, and what is the same yearly worth?' And he adds the interesting remark: 'Although this kind of tenure be in manner worne out of use, yet some there are (no doubt) though concealed in some manors, never infranchized or manumized.'[3] He speaks from personal knowledge. He was himself involved in the mean business of detecting the last and almost lost traces of the odious brand. In 1617 he

[1] *Surveyinge*, p. 13, ed. 1539.
[2] *Surveyor's Dialogue*, pp. 77–9 (ed. 1607). [3] *Ib.* p. 105.

discovered three bondmen in the manor of Falmer, Sussex, who 'were never manumitted.'[1] In 1619–1621 he made a most interesting survey of the forest of Pickering. The third article of his interrogatories is, 'What workes the *bonde* tenantes, sokemen, cotaries and others ought to perform etc.?' The fortieth article of the supplementary questions: 'How the workes to be done by the tenantes of Pickeringe are performed, or the monie in lieu of them yearlie payde, namely of the *bondemen* there, 75*s.* 7½*d.*,'[2] shows that evidently Norden was of opinion that there were still bondmen in the manor. But in this case he met with the total denial of the tenants. 'They say that to their knowledge there is not at this daye anie bonde or sokemen.'[2] Whether in his opinion the jurors were sincere or not Norden does not inform us.

The occurrence of the article on bondmen in Norden's manorial survey does not stand alone. It is a very curious fact that almost all legal and economic writers of the period devote much space and attention to this 'antiquated' subject of villeinage. Fitzherbert of the 'Surveyinge' gives the form of the oath for a villein both with and without a tenement.[3] Fitzherbert of the 'Novel Natura Brevium' deals at large with all the intricacies of procedure connected with the proving of serfdom or freedom in the law courts. It is interesting, too, to note that in the innumerable sixteenth-century editions of the 'Modus tenendi curiam baronis cum visu franci plegii,' a handbook which is extremely short, the formulas relating to villeinage occupy a considerable place. From one of the eldest editions, printed by Wynkyn de Worde, I have copied the respective English articles of presentment in the Court Baron and the Latin 'entres del court baron.' They fill almost two large pages of minute handwriting, and they are reprinted in other editions of the handbook, even in so late an edition as that by Toye in 1546. I have to point

[1] *Notes and Queries*, ser. 1, i. 139.

[2] Norden's survey of the manor is printed in the publications of the *North Riding Record Soc.* i. 13–63 (1894). The passages quoted can be found on pp. 13, 21, 27.

[3] Ch. xviii.

out, however, that Kitchin's handbook of procedure in the manorial courts (the first edition appeared in 1580), which is much larger than the older Moduses, speaks much less of the villeins; and the same observation is true of Jonas Adames's 'Manner of Keeping Court Leet,' which appeared in 1593. I have found there only one mention of villeins; it is the presentment of fugitive bondmen.[1]

At least three Tudor statutes speak of villeins as of a class still in existence. In 28 Hen. VIII. the House of Lords discussed and rejected the bill *De manumissione servorum vulgariter dictorum bondmen*,[2] and it is very well known that the emancipation of bondmen formed one of the demands of the Norfolk rebels in 1549.

In the same way all law treatises which are something more than mere collections of forms of procedure profess the opinion that villeinage is in full force. I have already named some of them, and I must mention the rest. In the last Year Books when the learned judges or serjeants of Edw. IV., Hen. VII., and Hen. VIII. try to establish some difficult and obscure point of law, they very often discuss some real or hypothetical villeinage case to make their reasoning more concrete and convincing. Bacon when, in 1600, delivering, at Gray's Inn, a course of lectures on a very special subject, comes across villeins and discusses their legal status.[3] Need I refer to the works of St. Germain, of Littleton, of Coke? I hope it is no exaggeration to say that they devote to the legal aspect of villeinage at least as much attention as Bracton himself.

I do not attach too much significance to this consensus of legal opinion. I know that the learned authors of the time made little, if any, difference between things dead and alive, and perhaps lived under the old law more than under the new one. At the same time can we altogether ignore their

[1] Kitchin, ed. 1580, p. 10; Adames, ed. 1593, p. 133.

[2] Bill of Resumption of 1 H. VII. in *Rotuli Parl.* vi. 339 *a–b*, 3 H. VII. c. 3, 19 H. VII. c. 15, s. 4; *Journal of the House of Lords*, 28 H. VIII. 16 die et 22 die huius parliamenti.

[3] *Works*, vii. 437 (Reading of the Statute of Uses).

unanimous allegations? One point more is worth attention before we leave this somewhat invidious subject of personal opinion for the solid ground of positive law and statistics. Following in the steps of the Roman *jurisperiti*, the mediæval laymen and canonists strongly disapproved of serfdom in theory. The law of God and the law of nature demand freedom and equality. This opinion was held in England by Bracton and repeated afterwards by many eminent authors: Britton, Fortescue, Coke. Then in the Tudor time, when serfdom was passing away, some lawyers begin to look for its theoretical justification and to regret its disappearance.

St. Germain appeals only to the practical dangers of doubt, to prescription, and to the conscience-soothing example of the clergy.

Doctor: Whether it may stand with conscience that one man may claim another to be his villein, and that he may take from him his lands and goods, and put his body in prison if he will: it seemeth he loveth not his neighbour as himself that doth so to him.

Student: That law hath been so long used in this realm, and hath been affirmed by bishops, abbots, priors, which have seized the lands and goods of their villeins thereby, and call it their right inheritance so to do: that I think it not good now to make doubt, ne to put in argument, whether it stand with conscience or not.[1]

But the old steward of the Hundred of Berkeley, regretting with a learned writer the disappearance of serfdom, appeals, like a real son of the Renaissance, to the very nature of things and to the authority of Aristotle for the justification of villeinage.

'And I conceive (which also a learned writer hath lately published) that the laws concerning villeinage are still in force, of which the latest are the sharpest. But now, saith he, and that most truly in my opinion, since slaves were made free, which were of great use and service, there are growne up a rabble of rogues, cutpurses, and the like mischievous men,

[1] *Doctor and Student*, ed. Muchall (1874), ii., ch. xviii. May I remind that the doctor is a doctor of divinity and the student is a student of law?

slaves in nature though not in law. And if any thinke this kind of dominion not to bee lawfull, yet surely it is naturall. And certainly wee finde not such a latitude of difference in any creature, as in the nature of man; wherin the wisest excels the most foolish of men by farre greater degree, then the most foolish of men dothe surpasse the wisest of beasts. And therfore wee shall finde that nature is the ground of masterly power, and of servile obedience, which is therto correspondent; and a man is animal politicum, apt even by nature to comaund or obey every one in his proper degree.'[1]

I must now sum up the literary evidence. The whole legal literature of the Tudor period deals with villeinage just in the same way as the work of Bracton does. It does not prove the real extent of villeinage, and it may be that these writers followed an antiquated legal tradition. Of greater significance perhaps is the circumstance that the forms of procedure in bondmen's cases found a prominent place in the thoroughly and exclusively practical handbooks compiled for manorial stewards and bailiffs. Harrison is the only author who utterly denies the existence of villeinage under Elizabeth (and even in much older times), and his assurance inspires very little confidence. About the same time Sir Thomas Smith (and his statement also raises some suspicions) tells us that bondmen have become very scarce, but only of late, and that before the Dissolution they existed in considerable numbers on the Church estates. The author of 'Surveyinge' in the middle of Henry VIII.'s reign strongly disapproves of villeinage, but he does not treat it as an innocent survival; on the contrary he complains that it was still possible for a free person to become bond, and he tells us the precise circumstances. It is necessary to cross the borders of the Tudor period and to consult Norden in order to trace the last villeins. He entered some of them in his surveys, and he could have shown us many more if he had chosen. A little

[1] *Berkeley MSS.* iii. 43 (1885). J. Smyth was steward of the Berkeley Hundred in 1597–1640. He wrote the passage in the thirties of the seventeenth century. I do not know who his 'learned author' is.

later the old steward of the Berkeley Hundred assures us that there are no villeins left. Then when they are no more people begin to regret that they have disappeared so soon.

The literary evidence gives very little satisfaction to the student who is longing for concrete knowledge and for definite ideas. Certainly it affords him some general outlines of the history of the decaying villeinage, but this is not the kind of information he desires. Mr. Leadam is perfectly right. Our information is too sparse and scanty. We cannot have statistics of bondmen in the sixteenth century. But we must at least have some substitute for them. We must go to the court rolls, to the surveys, to the manumissions, if we wish to know something definite about these bondmen of the sixteenth century. And we must count as many of them as we can. I know such figures give very indifferent statistics, or rather no statistics at all, but they are better than nothing. For my part I have done as much as I could, and it is very little indeed.[1] But it is the first attempt to introduce figures into the treatment of this question, and I hope to see my list of Tudor bondmen very soon superseded by a much longer one.

Various circumstances of a personal nature have limited the amount of material I have been able to examine. A great part of it was either printed or quoted by other writers, and in this case only the collection, the arrangement, and the analysis, not the discovery of the evidence, belong personally to me.

The evidence is arranged by counties and by manors. In each county and in each manor for which we have information of various dates the entries are arranged in chronological order. In a few cases it was impossible to identify the locality; they are treated separately. A student is naturally inclined rather to overstate than to understate his case. I have taken special precautions against this, and I hope it will be found that I have not overestimated the number of Tudor bondmen, and that my evidence is perfectly reliable. It is exclusively

[1] See Appendix.

documentary, being derived from manumissions, surveys, court rolls, official correspondence, legal proceedings.

Some explanation of the figures is necessary. The surveys and the inventories give precise information. Mostly they divide villeins into families (parents and children ; in a very few cases three generations are given together), and they enumerate fathers and children. They omit mothers (except when they are widows, and therefore tenants, or when the wife only is bond and the husband free) because these were of no use to the lord : they did not pay rents or chevage or merchet ; they were not liable to services or fines of admission. Manumission charters usually give similar information, but the editors, when printing the full text or the extracts, do not enumerate the children in all cases. On the contrary the entries in the court rolls seldom tell us the composition of the family : in the case of payments of merchet the name of the girl only is mentioned and sometimes that of the father ; in the case of chevage that of the adult male paying it. I have tried to count the villein families for two generations, and I counted an adult bachelor as a unit, but it must be remembered that in many cases the villeins were bachelors (and often it is expressly stated). My impression is that bondmen of the Tudor period married late and produced small families, so that we have to be reserved in guessing at the whole number of bond persons from the number of villein families.

What is the meaning of the table ? In the Tudor period I have found bondmen in twenty-six English counties and at least in eighty manors, but probably they existed in many more. It is difficult to count the families ; but certainly the table contains something above five hundred different families (the adult bachelors counted also as a family unit). And I hope I shall be near the mark in supposing that there were about two thousand persons in them. Now it is necessary to discriminate the dates. It is obvious enough that all, or almost all, families which remained bond under Elizabeth and James were bond under Henry VII. and Henry VIII. I am perfectly entitled to say that I can show at least five hundred

bond families at the day of the battle of Bosworth. But certainly many of these families became free and some were extinct before Elizabeth. How many families, then, remained in Elizabeth's time? From the Elizabethan surveys and commissions of enfranchisement which form a very great part of my material it appears that, excluding the bondmen of the Glastonbury Survey, some two hundred and fifty families remain to be accounted for, and about two hundred of these occur in Elizabethan sources.

I attribute little importance to this part of my table. It would be a hazardous thing to guess from it the whole number of the Tudor bondmen. My evidence relates chiefly to the Glastonbury estates, to the lands of the Duchy of Lancaster, and to some Crown manors. I have no doubts whatever that these bondmen discovered in my scanty materials formed a small, perhaps a very small, percentage of the whole bond population. But it may be said that the Glastonbury case and that of the Duchy of Lancaster were exceptional. Further researches will decide this point, especially if they are made in private archives and not exclusively in the Record Office. On the whole I agree with Tudor authors that the great majority of the bondmen became free before the Tudor period; and I cannot disagree with modern writers when they affirm that the bondmen of the sixteenth century were not an important class in the life of the country. Though no real statistics of the Tudor population and its division into classes are available at the present time, it is probable that, even in the beginning of the period, bondmen formed hardly more than one per cent. of the whole population. It is very little, but it is much more than some people believe, and it is a strong testimony of the great vitality of the manorial system. When we consider that late in the reign of Elizabeth there were still thousands, if not tens of thousands, of people paying merchet and chevage, and with very precarious rights over their real and personal property, we may feel amazed at the vitality and force of mediæval serfdom; and, what is of much more importance, we may feel inclined to find some

traces of mediæval serfdom in the life of other classes of society, much more numerous and much more influential.

I have included in my table those cases only where no doubt exists about the presence of bondmen in blood. In many other cases their existence is either possible or probable.

In the mediæval charters the name of the manor granted is generally followed by the enumeration of the *pertinentia*, and the villeins are included in the number. It is said, for instance, 'habendum et tenendum in perpetuum mesuagia, tenementa, terras, aquas, piscarias, brueras, moras, funda vacua, nativos et villanos, cum eorum sequelis, feoda militum, warda etc.' The formula occurs in many Tudor grants. I have found it in a conveyance of 1616. In very many cases the formula undoubtedly was copied from earlier charters by mere routine, and no more villeins remained in the manor. But was it so everywhere?[1]

Some accounts of the Augmentation Office tell us expressly that there are *nativi* in the manor. But the clerks might have been inaccurate in discriminating between *nativus* and *nativè tenens*. The meaning becomes especially dubious where we find the words *redditus nativorum tenentium*.[2]

[1] Here are some examples:—Rymer, xiv. 43–5 = Pat. 17 H. VIII. p. 2 m. 20, many Lincolnshire manors; *Yorkshire Archæol. Assoc. Journal*, lxiii. (1901), 333 = Close, 31 H. VIII. p. 4, n. 27, nunnery of Kirklees; *East Anglian*, vii. 274–5 = Pat. 35 H. VIII. p. 1, m. 27, Dry Drayton, Cambridgeshire; *Dartmoor Preserv. Assoc. Publ.* i. 161 = Pat. 38 H. VIII. p. 1, m. 35, Wolkehampton, Devonshire; Blashill, Sutton-in-Holderness, 134–6, 5 Edw. VI. Sutton, Yorkshire, E.R.; Boxall, *Records of the Duke of Manchester*, manorial estates, manor of Kimboltòn, Huntingdonshire, pp. 53–4, grant of 14 H. VIII.: 'we have given all lands, tenements, rents, services, bond-tenants, and villeins etc.' pp. 57–9, conveyance of 1616. All court leets are alienated, with all that to court leets belonge Assize of bread, waifes etc., bondmen, bondwomen, and villeins, with their sequels, estovers etc.' I mention also two examples of leases for years where 'rents and services of freeholders and *natives*' are entered: Campbell, *Henry VII.* (Roll Series), ii. 333–4, 3 H. VII. Snettesham, Norfolk; Brewer, iv. 4993, 27 = Pat. 20 H. VIII. p. 1, m. 9, Grafton, Northamptonshire.

[2] The accounts of 34 H. VIII. are printed in Dugdale's *Monasticon*, ii. 124–6; iii. 232: (*a*) a battia de Croyland, Lincolnshire; redd' nativor' ten' ꝑ cop' cur'; (*b*) a battia de Kyrkefee Lincolnshire; redd' assis' cūm redd' nativ' ꝑ cop' voc' Kyrkefee; (*c*) manor of Gedney, Leicestershire; redd' nativor' ꝑ feod' abbis cū redd' ass'; (*d*) Holbeche, Cambridgeshire; redd' ass' cū redd' nativor' ꝑ cop'; (*e*) Addyngton Parva et Magna, Northamptonshire; redd' ass' et terrar' nativor' ꝑ cop' cur';

Royal commissioners were sent in 17 Henry VIII. to visit six manors (Grafton, Hertwell, Creyke, Clay Cotton, and Lylburn in Northamptonshire, Woodham Ferres in Essex) and to report according to instructions. One of the articles orders inquiry as to 'what bondmen are in the manor.' Apparently, then, they were expected to find bondmen there.[1]

A very strange passage occurs in the Derby Household Books, in the 'Orders touching the governement of My lord's house.[2] That no *slaves* nor boyes shall sitt in the hall, but in the place therefore appoynted convenyent. . . . That the yemen of horses and groomes of the stable shall not suffre any boyes or *slaves* to abye about the stables nor lye in them.' I have not met with the term 'slaves' elsewhere except in the famous Edwardian statute on vagabonds and in the above quoted passage of J. Smyth. May we suppose that Lord Derby had coloured people in his household?

It was pleaded in many lawsuits of the Tudor period that such and such persons were villeins in blood. It happened sometimes that the law courts found them free after having tried the issue.[3] In some cases the supposed villein did not bring any defence, and so acknowledged his servile blood.[4]

(*f*) Sutton, Lincolnshire; redd' assis' cū redd' nativ.' Of the same character is an entry in the Valor Eccl. iv. 4: Episcopatus Lincolnensis, manor of Farundon, Notts: redditus nativor' cū opibus arrent' p̄ añum 23*l.* 9*s.* redd' ass' 6*l.* 17*s.* But the presence of bondmen in Farundon becomes highly probable if Farundon and Farneton is the same place (see my table). It is instructive to consider the use of the words *nativi tenentes* in the Cressingham Court Rolls (Norfolk), edited by Chandler, pp. 62 and 88, 5 H. VII. and 26 Eliz. I think that bond tenements, and not bondmen, are meant there.

[1] Brewer, iv. 2000.

[2] Chetham Society, *Stanley Papers*, vol. ii. The date is 1558.

[3] Y.B. 14 H. VII. 5. Noy, *Rep.* 27 = Hil. 15 Jac. I. Common Bench (see my table, p. 286, note 4). Very interesting is a case in the Court of Requests, edited by Mr. Leadam for the Selden Society (xii. 42–6, Netheway *v.* Gorge, 25 H. VIII.) and interpreted in his articles in the *L.Q.R.* (ix. 348 *sqq.*). But I cannot agree with all details of Mr. Leadam's commentary. He thinks that the award of the defendant with the uncles of the plaintiff was a manumission. The matter is not perfectly clear for me. I think the rowdy and greedy knight had to give up because twenty witnesses stood unanimously for the plaintiff.

[4] Here and in the next note I quote some cases of Edward IV.'s time, but I do not include them in my table. Y.B. 21 Edw. IV. 5 and 181, 11 H. VII. 13;

But in most cases we do not know the value of the pleading or the decision of the Court.[1]

I have tried not to lose my critical temper in dealing with the Tudor bondmen. Not in every case where we meet the word 'villeins' are we entitled to say that we have found bondmen in blood. In the sixteenth century men used the word rather loosely. Very often the term 'villeins' means simply common people, low people, or peasants. The rebels who took part in the Pilgrimage of Grace wanted to expel all villein blood from the King's Grace and his Privy Council.[2] It is rather curious to read that these very Privy Councillors of villein blood wrote of the rebels: 'To consider with themselves if it be likely that so few villeins and labourers could have stirred or raised in despite of so many gentlemen their own tenants against them and us.'[3] In 1549 Cranmer preached on the Norfolk rebels, and wrote an answer to the fifteen articles of the Devon rebels. He says: 'A gentleman will ever show himself a gentleman, and a villain, a villain. . . Will ye now the villains rule the gentlemen?[4] But of more interest are the cases where *villani* means *habitatores villæ*.

In a court held in the manor of Bromley Regis, Staffordshire, in 9 Edward IV., an old book was read specifying the rents and services of low tenure in Kinges Bromley. One class of the tenants is called *villani custumarii*, but it is added, 'villani dicuntur a villa et non a villeinage.' The old custumal says so, but it was considered in 9 Edward IV. as still being in force.[5] In the Dartmoor Court Rolls

Dyer, *Rep.* 266 *b* and 283, where the Court found the defendant to be villein. Cf. Y.B. 22 H. VI. pp. 30–3, giving two very interesting cases.

[1] The Year Books and the early reports are no mere records of Court proceedings; they have something of the nature of text-books; in every case those points only are reported which have a legal interest. Very often we do not know the decision. Y.B. 2 E. IV. 5, 6 E. IV. 8, 12 E. IV. 4, 13 E. IV. 2–4, 15 E. IV. 32 + 17, E. IV. 3, 13 H. VII. 17; Dyer, *Rep.* 48 *b*; Paschal, 33 H. VIII.; Star Chamber Proc. II. VIII. 6, 19 *n*, 178; Selden Soc. xii. 48–59, 32 H. VIII., 6 E. VI; Yelverton, *Rep.* 2 King's Bench, 1 Jac. I.

[2] Gairdner, xi. 705, 892.

[3] *Id.* xi. 843.

[4] *Works* (Parker Soc.), ii. 185, 195.

[5] St. Shaw, *Hist. of Staffs.* (1798), i. 147.

(Devonshire) for 31 Elizabeth we read twice about the villeins of Brysworthie. The general meaning of the entries and the analogous entry for Sourton make it perfectly clear that villeins of Brysworthie are simply inhabitants of Brysworthie.[1]

Now it may be said, granted that some villeins remained at the end of the sixteenth century ; but what was their position *de iure* and *de facto*? How did they differ from the customary tenants who were personally free?

The law of villeinage was never abrogated, and it had changed very little since the days of Bracton. In the momentous days when the glorious land of freedom stood face to face with the danger of domestic slavery Hargrave could bless the circumstance of the preservation of the law of villeinage which prevented the introduction of a new slavery.[2]

In the early statement of the law of villeinage there is not much difference visible between Bracton and Littleton, Britton and St. Germain, Fleta and Coke upon Littleton, whilst the thirteenth century law of villeinage can hardly be stated better for the present purpose than it has been by Professor Vinogradoff and by Professor Maitland. It is useless to tell the same things again, and very bold must the scholar be who hopes to modify substantially their conclusions. But I have to do with the changes in the law of villeinage subsequent to the thirteenth century. Here again a part of the work has been lately done by Professor Petrushevsky, who has treated at large the position created for the villeins by the Edwardian labour legislation.[3]

[1] *Dartmoor Preserv. Assoc. Publ.* i. 143–4. Court Rolls of May 8, 31 Eliz.: 'Presentant unam ianuam vocatam Hart Yeate infra parochia de Meavie quam villani de Brysworthie reparare debent esse in ruinoso.' Court Roll of May 29, 31 Eliz. We read, 'villani de Brysworthie in mīa' because they have not yet repaired the gate. But in the identical case in the Court Roll of Sept. 21, 30 Eliz., we find the 'inhabitantes de Sourton.'

[2] *Argument in Somersett's Case*, pp. 34–5 (1772).

[3] *Wat Tyler's Rebellion*, part ii. Essays on the Decay of the Feudal System (Russian), chiefly 260–85 (1901). Before him Professor Vinogradoff had pointed out the chief features of the Edwardian labour legislation, *Villenage*, pp. 53–5,

Some of the changes were a result of new economic conditions. Many villeins went into towns, became tradesmen there, and entered into various contracts, both as creditors and debtors, with all sorts of people. Even in the country new conditions of credit made it possible for the peasant to lend and to borrow. The Elizabethan inventories of bondmen's goods and chattels often contain lists of debtors and creditors; and some of these lists are pretty long, even in a remote Dorset village.[1] The later law was obliged to acknowledge the civil rights and liabilities of the villein where it was necessary to save the interest of the third persons. St. Germain tells that if a villein has a debtor and the lord seises the obligation, the lord can take no action thereupon but in the name of the villein; and therefore if the villein releases the debt, the lord is barred by that release.[2]

The intention is clear. If the debtor has satisfied to the villein, the lord cannot oblige him to pay again. In the same spirit Littleton declares that if a villein be made executor to another, and the lord of the villein was indebted to the testator, the villein shall have an action of debt against his lord, because he shall not recover the debt to his own use but to the use of the testator.[3] On the other hand, the later law tries to prevent the villein from availing himself of the new tenures to the prejudice of the lord. In the latest statute mentioning bondmen it is ordered that if any bondman purchases lands and makes an estate thereof to divers persons to his own use, it will be lawful for the lord to enter into such lands in the same manner as if the bondman were seised thereof in fee or otherwise.[4]

and Appendix 412–5. I do not agree in all points with Professor Petrushevsky. See my review of his book in *E.H.R.* October 1902.

[1] For instance, Duchy of Lanc. Spec. Com. n. 122, 7 Eliz.: E. Payne of Anderstone in Dorset, husbandman, two debtors and thirteen creditors. *Ib.* n. 55, 4 Eliz.: R. Mackerell of Kingston Lacy in Dorset, eleven creditors. John Kinge of Norwiche (*ib.* n. 157, 9 Eliz.) is an interesting example of a villein who lived in the town. He has five debtors and very many creditors.

[2] *Doct. and Stud.* (ed. Muchall), ii. 43.

[3] Litt. s. 191 = Co. Lit. 124 *a*.

[4] 19 H. VII. c. 15, s. 4.

But the most important change in the law of villeinage is connected with the labour legislation. This is not the proper place to discuss the whole of that wide subject. I shall treat this legislation only in its connexion with the legal history of villeinage. Professor Petrushevsky shows very well that the Edwardian statutes struck a very heavy blow at the whole fabric of the manorial system. The feature of the manorial circle disappears. The unemployed villein became servant of every employer; the employer wanting labourers became master of every unemployed villein; the legal category of free and bond dissolved itself in the wider economic category of employer and employé. The agents of the King and of the common law, the justices of assize and the justices of peace, entered into the sacred precinct of the manor in order to control the relations between the lord and his villeins. Though perfectly hostile to liberal tendencies, the labour legislation in the long run certainly assisted to loosen the dependence of the bondman on his lord. The man of manorial custom to a certain extent changes into a man of common law. The lord retains the preferential right over the working power of his villein; but when the villein does not find employment in his manor and is vagrant everybody can seize and put him to work, and the lord cannot take him back into his manor until the end of the statutory contract.[1] The statutes led to infinite collisions of rights which it was sometimes extremely difficult to disentangle. Professor Petrushevsky has explained the curious case in the fourteenth century in which a villein brought an action against his lord for taking away his servants contrary to the Statute of Labourers.[2] The statute was directed against the villeins who refused to work at customary wages, not against the lords; but it was not difficult to use it against the lord. In a report which relates probably to Henry VII.'s time Keble reasons in this way. A villein can become everybody's servant, and everybody has

[1] Y.B. 50 E. III. 21.

[2] Petrushevsky, 331–2. *Chron. Mon. de Melsa* (Rolls Series), iii. 127–142.

an interest in a villein; therefore the lord must feed him sufficiently and keep him always able to work.[1]

But it is also possible to overestimate the disintegrating influence of this labour legislation. The practice of the law courts was by no means consistent, and the wording of the statute was by no means clear. The interests of the lord and of the employer necessarily came into collision, and the judges, lords and employers themselves, were often embarrassed. In some cases they favoured the lord. We find a most interesting case soon after the appearance of the statute (though it is not stated there that the servant was a villein) where an employer brought an action under the Statute of Labourers.[2]

We must not think that the law courts always forbade the lord to seize his villein after he had entered another's service, as it was decided in the above-quoted case of 50 Edw. III. Much later, in 26 Henry VI., we find in the Year Book just the contrary decision, and it is explained by the words of the statute, *Quod domini preferantur in villanis suis.*[3]

In the same year occurred another case which is perhaps the most important of all the cases in the Year Books connected with the later law of villeinage. The case is long and difficult.[4] A lord sues an employer for taking away his villein when the latter was in the service of the lord. The jury found upon inquest that the villein was in the service of the lord but was not retained with him.[5] The demurrer was whether the plaintiff was entitled to damages for the lost labour of his villein. The opinions differed. The case was heard three times, twice in the Common Pleas and once in the Court of Exchequer, where it was finally decided for the plaintiff. Most interesting are professional opinions about the relations between the lord, the villein, and the employer. On the one side we have the extreme view of the villein's

[1] Keilwey, pp. 134–5.
[2] Y.B. 40 E. III. 39.
[3] Y.B. 26 H. VI. 2.
[4] Y.B. 22 H. VI. 30–33.
[5] Another issue was about villein status. See p. 18 *a*, n. 2.

dependence. Though the villein be a tenant and a husbandman, the lord can whenever he likes order him to serve in his house or in his 'besoigne;' the whole of the villein's time is at the lord's disposal. It is not voluntary service or service by way of retainer, but *bond* service (that is to say, service connected with personal bondage). The inference is that the lord can always take his bondman from the employer. Even Fortescue, the friend of liberty, energetically defended the lord's rights in the Exchequer. Finally the Court decided that the lord can take his villein from the employer, and that he will be entitled to damages caused to him by the loss of his villein's labour.

Such judgments as those pronounced in the last two cases certainly limited very much the action of the Statute of Labourers as far as it concerned the villeins, if they did not annul it altogether. We must be very reserved when we try to show how the Statute of Labourers did work out in the daily practice of the law courts.

I come now to another side of the later law of villenage. It is the famous 'favour of liberty' that is generally supposed to be a very important cause of the disappearance of bondmen. 'The favour of liberty' is closely connected with the doctrine that serfdom is against the law of nature and the Word of God. If serfdom is nothing but a concession to the unavoidable harshness of human affairs and a bad compromise, if you cannot destroy it at once, you must at least, by all means, whenever an occasion presents itself, favour the presumption of natural liberty. We are often told that English lawyers since Bracton's day have always followed this noble line of conduct. The last time when exception of villeinage was pleaded in an English law court, in Somersett's case, Hargrave developed this view with much force and many technical details.[1] There can be no doubt that the common law courts were always inclined to construe a manumission when they found the least ground for it, and that this tendency was very favourable for the villeins. But we cannot

[1] Argument, pp. 29–33.

explain the fact solely from humanitarian and religious motives. Strange to say, the facility with which the English lawyers construed a manumission was largely due to the harshness of the legal theory of villeinage. A villein had no civil remedy against his lord; he could conclude no bargain with him; his reality and personality belonged to the lord; he must become a free person before he could stand against him in a court. This ground was dangerous. It was so tempting, from the purely logical point of view always dear to every good lawyer, to interpret the theory in favour of liberty, and it was construed in this sense. If only a freeman can deal with a freeman, then every action, every word, in which, in the opinion of the Court, the lord treated the villein on equal terms as a party to the contract becomes an acknowledgment that the latter is a freeman, and it amounts to a manumission. More than that, every omission of protest on the part of the lord against the villein's action which could be understood as the act of a freeman led to the same result: it could be pleaded as an enfranchisement. For a lawyer it was not an easy task to plead for the lord against the villein, and I presume, having gained the case, he presented a heavy bill to his client. To this extent, then, the policy of the Courts certainly was in favour of liberty. But was it pure philanthropy and love of freedom? The lawyers themselves did not think so.[1] Littleton was no enemy of the lords, but he says much of manumission through bad pleading, if we may say so. This policy of the Courts was very distasteful to the lords, but it was the necessary consequence of the rigid theory on which their seignorial rights rested.

It is equally true that it was difficult for the lord to gain his case when he claimed a villein and the man answered he was always of free estate. As to the *onus probandi*, the reader can be referred to the pages of Dr. Vinogradoff's work, because the later law is the same as in the days of Bracton and Britton.[2] We meet with the 'favour of liberty' in another case. The lord is obliged to find pledges that he will not seize the

[1] Y.B. 9 H. VI. 67.

[2] *Villanage*, pp. 83–6.

plaintiff or his chattels pending a suit. It was argued that the plaintiff ought not to give any surety because he must live and keep up his husbandry and spend much on his trial.[1] We may perceive here the same sentiment or the same policy which, a little later, led to the establishment of pleading *in forma pauperis*. The place of trial was also in favour of liberty, as Littleton remarks. If the defendant answered that the plaintiff was his villein regardant to a manor in another county, the issue was tried in the county where the action was brought, and not where the manor lay.[2] Lastly, in an Elizabethan case we find a decision 'in favour of liberty,' but it hardly was unanimous. The defendant, Crouch, was a villein, but he and his ancestors had dwelt for very long—about sixty years—outside the manor, and the lords had made no claim and had no seisin either of him or his chattels. It was decided that sixty years formed prescription and that Crouch became a free man. 'Et hoc in favorem libertatis.'[3]

In connexion with the favour of liberty, we may remember the remarkable words of Sir T. Smyth: 'And I conceive (which also a learned writer hath lately published) that the laws concerning villeinage are still in force, of which the latest are the sharpest.'[4] Who is his learned writer? What are these 'latest' and 'sharpest' laws? It is certainly strange that putting aside the Year Books, Statutes of the Realm, and the Parliamentary Rolls, we find very little of this 'favour of liberty.' The Statutes and the Rolls contain but few entries relating to villeins, but of these few hardly one is favourable to them. A statute passed in 25 Edward III. made the position of the villeins considerably worse. Before this when the lord sued *De nativo habendo* the villein by purchasing the counter-writ *De libertate probanda* was safe pending the trial. But this statute gave the lord the right of seizure in spite of the writ. And the effect of the statute proved so great that, according to Fitzherbert, the writ *De libertate probanda* almost fell into

[1] 12 E. IV. 4 . . . ascuns disoient que il ne diut trover tel suerty, car il diut viver et aver son sustenance de les biens, et auci faire les costes de son triel.

[2] Litt. s. 193. [3] Dyer, *Rep.* 266 *b*, 283. [4] Supra, p. 244.

disuse.[1] The famous statute of 1 Richard II. (so closely connected with Tyler's rebellion) about villein confederacies and 'exemplificacions hors de livre de Domesday,' is certainly directed against the villeins. It institutes a summary procedure to prevent further disturbances.[2] The statute of 9 Richard II. was passed in the interests of the lords and against the villeins. It complains that the villeins and niefs escape to enfranchised places and therefrom purchase false writs against their lords, hoping to become free by the answer of the lord; it is ordered now that the lord's answer in the law will be no bar thenceforward to claiming the villein.[3] I have mentioned a much later statute which guarantees to the lord full rights over the lands of his bondman who became *cestuy que use*.[4]

The knights of the shire sat in the House of Commons. Is it not natural enough that their petitions are almost invariably hostile to the villeins? In their desire to keep down the peasants the country gentlemen went beyond the Government, and a polite refusal is often the King's answer to the requests of the manorial lords. In 15 Richard II. they present two petitions concerning the bondmen. They desire that no villein might send his children to school to make clerks of them, 'et ce en maintenance et salvacion de l'honour de toutz frankes du Roialme.' But the King answered, 'Le Roy s'advisera.'[5] Then the Commons complain that the villeins withdraw every day into 'veiles marchauntes,' wherefrom it is impossible to take them back in the present state of the law. Some new legal sureties are desirable. But the King answered again, 'Le Roy s'advisera.' The Commons repeated their complaint in 1 Henry IV.[6]

Twice under Henry IV. we find the Commons protesting against severe villein statutes passed under Richard II. in

[1] 25 E. III. st. 5, c. 18; Fitzherbert, *Nov. Nat. Brev.* 77, 'Libertate probanda.' Coke (Co. Lit. 126 *a*) calls the statute 'darkely and obscurely penned.'

[2] 1 R. II. c. 6.

[3] 9 R. II. c. 2.

[4] 19 H. VII. c. 15, s. 4.

[5] *Rot. Parl.* iii. 294.

[6] *Ib.* iii. 296, iii. 448 *a*.

connexion with peasants' rebellions. Both petitions are very interesting: to a certain degree they make intelligible to us the origin of the 'favour of liberty.' In 4 Henry IV. the Commons refer to 9 Richard II. c. 2. They say that this statute is being abused. Under the cover of it all ruffians and all debtors when a writ is purchased against them by free persons, and even by gentlemen, answer invariably that the plaintiff is their villein. The answer is entered in the Plea Roll and easily leads to the loss of freedom. The Commons think that such answer ought to be perpetual enfranchisement to the plaintiff in all cases where the plaintiff has not fled to a privileged place and has purchased his writ in the place of his usual residence. But the King answers that the statute must be kept in force.[1] A similiar petition is presented in 6 Henry IV. The Commons speak now of 1 Richard II. c. 6. This statute is also being abused. The lords seldom touch their villeins, but burgesses and freeholders are often arrested as villeins. The Commons think that freeholders ought not to be put in gaol at once, and that they could be released on bail. But the King answered again in the negative that the respective statute ought to be kept in force.[2]

The severity of the villein statutes, not less than the rigidity of the legal theory of serfdom, was a dangerous weapon and led to unexpected consequences. When the peasants formed confederacies and threatened a rebellion it was natural to establish a summary procedure and to simplify the proof of villein status. But the rebels are subdued and the statutes remain. Then the position is changed. The aristocracy is not slow to perceive that it is possible to make something out of this cruel law. Some lords of the manor do not care to pay their debts; others are glad to get hold of the wealth of their neighbours. They understand that by simply claiming their creditor or their rich neighbour as a villein they will make it difficult for a supposed villein to prove his free status; and so they profited by the villein statutes.

[1] *Rot. Parl.* iii. 499. [2] *Ib.* iii. 556 *a*.

Freeholders, burgesses, and, *horribile dictu*, gentlemen themselves became their victims. Then the reaction set in. I have little doubt myself that to a considerable extent the 'favour of liberty' was a matter of self-preservation.

There is a curious story preserved in the Parliament Rolls. It shows that about the middle of the fifteenth century people of position could be treated for years as villeins when the lord was a person of very high social standing.

From the tragic story of Whithorne's wrongs [1] we observe that when the lord of the manor, in the middle of the fifteenth century, was a prince of the blood it was difficult for the supposed villein to prove his free estate, even when he was a gentleman and a large landowner. Such stories help us to understand why the burgesses and the gentlemen addressed their petitions to the King for the 'favour of liberty.'

Much more than a century passed, and very considerable persons could still be claimed as villeins, and were in danger of undergoing 'a hardie and extreame usage' on the part of some great personage. A curious case in the 28th and 29th years of Elizabeth is found in the Acts of the Privy Council.[2] On March 31, 1586, a letter was sent from the Privy Council to the President and Council of Marches. The inhabitants of Thornbury, in Gloucestershire, complained of the hard and extreme usage against them of the Lord Stafford, who claimed them as his villeins regardant to that manor.[3] On May 11 a letter is addressed to Lord Stafford himself. He must appear before the President and Council of the Marches, and not leave before the hearing of the case, as he has done once. On June 19 another letter is addressed to his lordship, the most interesting in the whole *dossier*. 'That his Lordship forbeare to offer anie violence or other molestacion unto R. Cole, maior of the citye of Bristoll, and Th. Cole, his brother, by seeking to disturbe them in their trade and to sease their bodyes uppon pretence of challenging them to be

[1] *Rot. Parl.* v. 448–9 = Pat. 25 H. VI. p. 2, m. 9.
[2] Dasent, xiv. 48, 100, 153, 190, xv. 69, 303, 304.
[3] The evidence relating to the manor is given in my table'

his Lordship's bondmen, seinge they offer to aunswer his Lordship in lawe, and that their Lordships thincke it requisite that a principall officer of such a place and his brother, having ben both themselves and their auncestors heretofore reputed freemen, should not be so hardlie dealt upon anie supposicion.' Lord Stafford must report his claims to the Privy Council. A third message is forwarded to his lordship on July 17 'advertisinge him of the receipte of certaine depositions from the Counsell of the Marches of Wales touchinge his Lordship's hard dealinges against divers supposed by his Lordship to be his bondmen, and especially against T. Segar and T. Smithe, whiche if they have ben such towardes men reputed free and to be descended of free parentage, as in the deposicions is conteyned,' his lordship must restore them their damages. Generally he must claim his right according to law, without threatening and violence. Apparently the cautious decision of the Privy Councillors had little effect on the great nobleman. They write again to him on May 7, 1587. He sent no answer to the complaints of the Coles and tried to seize them by force. He has to sue according to law and to appear before the Council. On November 15 the Council's order is entered in the Proceedings that the case Cole *v.* Stafford is committed for trial to the Lord Chancellor, Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, and Mr. Justice Periam. No later entry about the case occurs in the Acts of the Privy Council, and we do not learn its decision.

In the absence of further evidence it is impossible to decide how much foundation there was for Lord Stafford's claims. Cole's ancestors may have been villeins regardant to the manor of Thornbury, but certainly the Mayor of Bristol of the end of the sixteenth century was a freeman of long repute and could rely on prescription. All the same Lord Stafford tries to seize him by force in the face of the Council with the probable intention of putting him into some Welsh dungeon, and the Privy Councillors are strangely reserved in their reprimands. The difference between the times of

Henry VI. and those of Elizabeth is very great. The Mayor of Bristol could hardly grow blind in a dark dungeon as poor Whithorne did ; the Privy Councillors and the Chief Justices would try to release him. But 'the favour of liberty' was a desirable thing for the burgesses even in 1586 and 1587.[1]

Such cases make it perfectly clear that villeinage in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries was not in all cases a harmless fiction, a half-forgotten survival of the old order of things. Even in the peaceful routine of country life the claims of the old villeinage are not yet worn out. Mr. Leadam has already pointed out that in the sixteenth century we meet with all the incidents of mediæval serfdom.[2]

In a case of 19 Henry VI. the attorney for the plaintiff defines 'the *esplees* in a villein,' that is to say, the profit which a lord can make out of his villein. The definition might be dated in the thirteenth century. It embraces tallage at will, average, merchet, and villein service.[3] In two cases of 21 Edward IV. villeins are treated as mere chattels. In one an abbot grants a villein of his monastery to a person for a term of years. In another a villein was seised of a relief as of his property ; the lord comes and seizes this relief as a chattel of his villein.[4] In 19 Henry VIII. the defendant (the Duchess of Buckingham) refuses to give any answer to the plaintiffs because they are her villeins regardant to the manor of Rompney.[5] Mr. Leadam has published an interesting case from the Proceedings of the Court of Requests in 25 Henry VIII.[6] A knight, Jorge, sent his steward to buy an ox. The steward went to a peasant, Netheway, and bought an ox of his for 26*s*. Netheway came to the knight to receive his money. But Jorge refused to pay under the pretext that Netheway was his bondman. And Netheway recites in his

[1] A special action is sometimes permitted to villeins, 'pur un dread ou fear.' Cf. Y.B. 2 E. IV. 5, 15 E. IV. 32+17; E. IV. 3, 13 H. VII. 17=Keilwey, *Rep.* 34, 35 H. VI. 12; *Calendar of Elizabethan Chancery Proceedings*, i., p. cxiii (1 R. III.).

[2] *L.Q.R.* ix. 348 and 99.

[3] Y.B. 19 H. VI. 32.

[4] Y.B. 21 E. IV. 5, 81.

[5] Brewer, iv. 3447.

[6] Selden Society, xii. 42-46, Netheway *v.* Jorge.

bill how Jorge was 'swerynge grete and detestable othis that he wolde have your sayde humble subgett his goodes ffor that he toke hym as hys bondman, and that he wolde sease his londes that he hyld of other men and kepe them dewerynge his lyfe, and that he wolde fleche hym att an horse tayle and make hym to turne a broch in hys kechyn.' There was much of pure boasting in the speech of the angry knight, the more because, as he knew well, his rights over Netheway were highly controversial. One thing is interesting in the case: Netheway does not deny Jorge's right to treat his villeins thus; he replies only that he is of free estate.

Manorial documents afford an even clearer insight into the legal and economic condition of the Tudor bondmen than the records of the King's Courts. Court rolls and surveys of the sixteenth century describe very emphatically the seignorial rights over the persons and goods of bondmen. Mr. Page (who is too optimistic in his estimate of the bondmen's condition) remarks that in the Ramsey Abbey Court Rolls the old formula, '*seisire in manum domini omnia bona et catalla omnium nativorum istius manerii*,' occurs until the very Dissolution.[1]

When R. Pollard and T. Moyle made the survey of the attainted Glastonbury estates they added to the statement of the number of bondmen in every manor the ancient words, 'whose bodies and goodes are at the Kinges highnes pleasure.'[2] The numerous Elizabethan commissions of enfranchisement often contain the instruction to make an inventory of lands and goods of the villeins to be manumitted. The explanation is usually added that their property ought to come into the hands of the lord, that is to say, of the Queen, as in the right of the Crown or of the Duchy of Lancaster.[3] On August 24, 1548, Sir R. Sakevyle receives a

[1] *End of Villeinage*, pp. 97, 98.

[2] Hearne, *Langtoft's Chronicle* = Dugdale, *Monast.* i. 10–21.

[3] See, for instance, *Duchy of Lanc. Spec. Comm.* 106, 6 Eliz. 'W. Parkeman is our villaine regardant to the manoure of Gymyngham and is seised of divers landes and chattels, by reason whereof the said landes and chattels ought

commission upon his appointment as Chancellor of the Court of Augmentations. The last article speaks of the manumission of villeins. The manumitted shall pay 'like fees for the great seall as have been used to have bene paid for makinge of *denyzens*.' I do not think that the identification of the two fees was a pure accident. In the mind of a Tudor statesman the idea of manumission easily comes to be associated with that of naturalisation. Certainly he did not consider bondmen as foreigners, but it was rather difficult for him to think of them as of real citizens like himself. In their petitions to the monarch the bondmen were allowed to call themselves 'true and loving subjects.' I am afraid they felt more the burdens than the privileges of English citizenship.

The villeins pay the merchet under Henry VIII. just as they paid it in the thirteenth century. On October 10, 1519, Alice Overye, daughter of William Overye, native of the lord of Scotter, came into the court of the manor and applied for the licence to marry spontaneously and voluntarily. The lord gave the licence through the steward, and Alice paid to the lord 5*s*. for the merchet *ut in capite*.[2] Among the numberless ministers' accounts in the Augmentation Office there is an account of 32 Henry VIII. for the manor of Weston Hunts. One of the items is: 'chevage for the licence to marry outside etc. 2*s*.'[3] In the invaluable Elizabethan survey of the villeins of Long Bennington, Lincs., and of their lands and goods, there is an appendix giving many extracts from the Court Rolls, from 4 Henry V. onwards, proving the villein status of some tenants. Five are entries of 'merchet,' and three of these relate to the Tudor period.[4]

In theory the Tudor bondmen, like their ancestors of the feudal age, had no right to leave the territory of their manor

of right to come to our handes and possession.' Cf. the numerous manumissions of H. Lee in *Duchy of Lanc. Miscellanea*, v. 102.

[1] *State Papers, Dom.*, E. VI., iv. n. 48.

[2] *Archæologia*, xlvi. 373.

[3] Dugdale, *Monast.* ii. 589.

[4] *Duchy of Lanc. Miscellanea*, $\frac{13}{19}$, fol. 9, 10, 5 H. V., 28 H. VI., 3 H. VII., 23 H. VII., 1 H. VIII.

without the licence of the lord, and they must pay for the licence. The amount of the payment for the most part is very small—a few pence, seldom a shilling—but the stewards insist on the due payment with more consistency than in the earlier days because it is very often the last tie which attaches an outside bondman to the manor and to the lord. If a bondman lived outside the manor, and left no tenements behind, it was easy to lose sight of him, and it was difficult to prove his villein status. The jurors of the manorial court depose pretty often that such and such was a bondman of the lord, but that he left the manor (or fled) many years ago, and now they do not know where he is dwelling or what his children and chattels are. The application for the licence to leave the manor is a clear confession of villein status, and therefore the lords do not allow a bondman to go away without licence. The bondman pays for the licence ; but the amount of the payment, generally called chevage, was very low, and certainly money was the least consideration in the bargain.[1] In the excerpts from the Long Bennington Court Rolls by far the greater part of the entries relate to outside bondmen. Many of them leave without any licence. Others come into the court and 'make fine and chevage for licence to live outside the manor.' They pay usually only 4*d.*, but in 22 Hen. VI.

[1] Mr. Page considers chevage as payment for licence to leave the manor (*End of Villeinage*, p. 92). Professor Vinogradoff criticises this opinion in his interesting review of Mr. Page's work (*E.H.R.* xv. 778). I fully agree with the view that payment of chevage was chiefly confession of villein status and recognition of seignorial authority ; but I have met no single case where chevage was paid by all villeins of the manor, at least in Tudor times. I put aside the rare cases in which free persons, chiefly apprentices, pay chevage or head-money (Scrope, *History of Castle Combe*, pp. 221, 245, 250). Bond persons pay chevage when they apply for the licence to leave the manor. I know only one exception, adduced by Miss Davenport, and relating to the manor of Forncett (*Trans. Roy. Hist. Soc.* xiv. 136). But if the bondman was a tenant his lands were *in potestate domini.* The lord could seize them whenever he wanted to enforce his seignorial rights. As a confession of villeinage, chevage was unnecessary in such cases. A tenant was usually a husbandman and lived on his tenement ; it was not difficult to trace his villein origin. But when the bondman had no lands, and went to some far-off place to earn his bread, payment of a certain amount of money, however small, for his head remained the only sign of his servile blood.

a bondman paid 2*s.*[1] The Crown surveyors of Edward VI. and of Elizabeth carefully enter the names of absent bondmen in the hope at some time or other of getting hold of their persons and goods. When the bondman dwelt in the neighbourhood it was possible to take him back or to make him pay his chevage. Three members of the Crane family were not to be found in their manor of Ormsby, Lincolnshire, in 36 Henry VI. John dwelt at Sybsay, Thomas at Stykforth; Agnes had fled, and where she dwelt was not known to the jurors. In the Court Roll of 11 Edward IV. I read that 'John Crane, native of the lord, dwells at Sybsay, and Thomas Crane, native of the lord, dwells at Stykford, and have placed themselves in chevage and give as appears on their heads.' The first Court Roll is interesting in another respect: it shows that in 36 Henry VI. it was still possible to require chevage for the fugitive bondmen from their next kinsmen.[2]

Fitzherbert mentions another survival of feudal conditions.[3] He says that bondmen pay more in the lord's mill than free persons. He knows an example where bondmen leave to the miller one twelfth of the meal, tenants at will one sixteenth, and the others from one twentieth to one twenty-fourth.

The last bondmen did not remain indifferent to their servility. Their free neighbours considered it as a degrading stain. It is very well known that a demand of emancipation of all bondmen was included in the articles of the Norfolk rebels. Amongst the Special Commissions of the Duchy of Lancaster is a curious document. A bondman of the manor of Shapwike begs the Queen to manumit him. 'Froward' persons object to him the name of bondman, and nobody desires to marry his children. There are some cases of free women married to villeins, but the petition proves that many free persons objected to such matches and looked down on the last bondmen.[4] Perhaps the position of villeins, from the

[1] *Duchy of Lanc. Miscellanea*, $\frac{13}{10}$, fol. 9, 10.

[2] Massingberd, *History of the Parish of Ormsby-cum-Ketsby*, 250–257 (1899).

[3] *Surveyinge*, p. 9.

[4] *Duchy of Lanc. Spec. Comm.* n. 7, 1 Elizabeth. Four examples of free women married to villeins occur in the Elizabethan survey of the manor of Long

social point of view, was more difficult under Elizabeth than under Edward I. Their condition had been worse in the thirteenth century, their life had been easier. They formed then the bulk of the rural population. The poorest serf whose property and person were at the lord's mercy could find many neighbours who stood on exactly the same level and treated him on equal terms. An average villein felt himself a member of the influential local community and of the most numerous class of the nation. It was a hard lot, but it was no shame to be a villein. Pitiless and 'froward' neighbours when working together in the open field or meeting in the tavern could not reproach a villein with his servile blood, could not laugh scornfully at his proposal of marriage: they were natives themselves. Then things changed towards the sixteenth century to the disadvantage of the last bondmen. They remained few and isolated, an undesirable reminder of the past or passing order of things which their happier neighbours tried to forget. It was natural that Norfolk bondmen persuaded Ket to insert the demand of their emancipation in the articles of 1549; that so many bondmen applied to Queen Elizabeth for manumission; that even more bondmen tried to conceal their servile origin and evaded the processes of the inquisitive surveyors. It is a hard thing to belong to a despised class of society even when it is very large; it is an intolerable hardship to be despised when one does not feel that many other creatures are subject to the same sufferings.

It sounds like a paradox, but it is literally true, as many paradoxes are, that for the bondman of the sixteenth century his personal dependence upon the lord became most burdensome at the moment when he got his freedom. The lord had in theory a superior right over the person, the lands, and the goods of the bondman. But the lord seldom enforced his right without any legal inducement. I have met with very few cases of purely arbitrary seizure of the bondman's property.

Bennington, *Duchy of Lanc. Miscellanea*, $\frac{18}{19}$. The instances of a bondwoman married to a freeman are more rare.

The amount of the exaction is very often 'at the lord's will,' but almost always there are some legal grounds for the exaction. Grant of freedom, manumission, was of their number. In my opinion manumission is the most important legal form of cessation of villeinage. By far the greater part of our evidence about Tudor bondmen is in some way or other connected with it. The charters of manumission spoke always of Word of God and law of nature, of charity and piety, of natural equality of all human beings, and unnatural character of serfdom. The manorial accounts and surveys when dealing with manumission waste little space in grand words, but they often mention that the grant of freedom was made *in consideracionem summe legalis monete Anglie*.

Three such entries occur in an interesting collection of Elizabethan manumission charters relating to the Duchy of Lancaster.[1] The same phrase occurs in five manumissions of 1556 which were granted to the last bondmen of the manor of Forncett. It is probable that one of the five serfs paid for his freedom so high a sum as 120*l*.[2] A royal commission of 16 Elizabeth recites that many bondmen applied for manumission. The commissioners, Sir W. Cecil and Sir W. Mildmay, are ordered to make inquiry of all bondmen of the Crown manors in Cornwall, Devon, Gloucestershire, and Somersetshire. Every manumitted person has to pay for his charter 26*s*. 8*d*.[3] A kind-hearted lord could give back to his former bondman the money he received for the charter of enfranchisement. There is an item in the accounts of the Duke of Buckingham, dated March 25, 1519: 'To W. Parker 40*l*. restored to him for a fine by him made to me, for that he was my bondman and made free during his life, for that I gave him a patent.'[4] In the register of St. Alban's Abbey the remark is entered under 1480 that T. Hale ought to

[1] *Duchy of Lanc. Miscellanea*, $\frac{13}{20}$: A. Johnson, A. Orbie, J. Allen.
[2] Davenport, *Trans. Royal Hist. Soc.* xiv. 140, 141.
[3] Rymer, xv. 731.
[4] Brewer, iii. 1285.

pay 40*s.* for his manumission, but that the fine was remitted in consideration of his poverty.[1]

Manumission of bondmen was regarded as a regular source of seignorial income. In 11 Elizabeth the jurors of the manor of High Easter, Essex, were asked about their customs and services. The thirteenth article of their answer refers to bondmen. They enumerated seven sons and two grandsons of the late Henry Pullen, mentioned the localities where they were residing, and added: 'There substaunce wee knowe not, but as wee thincke they are but poore men, and of smale substaunce, but what profitte wold be to the Quenes Majestie yf they were manumysed wee knowe not.'[2] The Year Books give us an instructive case of manumission proving that similar opinions existed already in the beginning of the fifteenth century. The plaintiff, a recently manumitted villein, complains that the Abbot of Hide, with other persons, made an assault on him, and by various threatenings compelled him to apply for manumission, for which, according to the award of the arbitrators, he paid 10*l.* to the abbot.[3] It is possible that this exaction of 10*l.* for the compulsory enfranchisement was the object of the abbot's assault; but the manumission and the award might also indicate previous exactions. At any rate the lord by sheer force compels his villein to be manumitted and makes a good profit out of the bargain, and the villein protests against the contract which led to his enfranchisement. The very amount of these exactions for enfranchisement was settled in the middle of the sixteenth century, at least in the practice of the Augmentation Office. The payment is very considerable. The bondmen manumitted must pay 'for the Great Seal' *a third part* of their lands and goods. We obtain here a clue to the frequency of manumissions on the Crown lands in the sixteenth century. The enfranchisement of the last bondmen was a paying policy.

The thing was done so openly in the sixteenth century

[1] II. 210 (Rolls Series). [2] *Duchy of Lanc. Spec. Comm.* n. 191.
[3] Y.B. 2 H. V. pp. 10, 11.

that Elizabethan courtiers could receive as a special sign of favour from the sovereign a commission [1] to enfranchise a definite number of villein families on the Crown manors; that is to say, they were enabled to repair their fortunes with the payments for enfranchisement. We are indebted for our most important evidence about Elizabethan bondmen to a commission of the kind directed to Sir H. Lee.[2]

On January 7, 17 Elizabeth, the Queen addressed an open letter to Sir H. Lee. She recites that many bondmen belonging to the Duchy of Lancaster applied to her for manumission. Lee is invested with the right to make a search for all bondmen in the duchy manors and to manumit 200 of them. He will agree with every single bondman about the fine for manumission. The enfranchisement and the corresponding payment are compulsory. None of the 200 bondmen chosen by Lee can refuse to be enfranchised or to buy his freedom at the price fixed by the royal patentee. If anybody declines to enter into an agreement Lee can seize his lands. Besides he can seize all lands alienated by bondmen since 10 Elizabeth. Upon every agreement Lee shall address a petition to the Chancellor of the Duchy, who will prepare the charter of enfranchisement.

Lee made prompt use of the royal grant. His first manumission is dated February 1, 17 Elizabeth. On June 21 in the same year he received a second patent empowering him to enfranchise 100 more bondmen of the duchy upon the same conditions. He made very many

[1] *State Papers, Domestic*, E. VI. iv. n. 48. Aug. 4, 1548. Commission to Sir Richard Sakewyle upon his appointment as Chancellor of the Exchequer.

[2] The documents relating to the Lee affair are collected in a large bundle, *Duchy of Lanc. Miscellanea*, $\frac{13}{19}$, bearing the title 'Sondrie graunts of bondmen and women in the nomber of 200 graunted by Queene Elizabeth to Sir Henry Lee, knight, with the names of those which weare by her Majestie manumised under the seal of this court for his benefitt etc. inferius p̃ with a survay or certificatt of bondmens landes and goods in Longbenyngton.' As I am explaining in the text, it is very probable that this important Long Bennington survey is connected with the same subject. The 102nd volume of the Miscellaneous Books of the Duchy of Lancaster contains copies of manumissions by Lee arranged in chronological order.

applications to the Chancellor of the Duchy for the preparation of manumission charters in 18 and 19 Elizabeth. On June 20 in 19 Elizabeth he addressed to the Chancellor a letter in connexion with the same business. He certified the names of twelve bondmen of the duchy and the value of their lands. One of them refused to enter into any agreement with Lee; the other eleven had alienated their lands during the last seven years. Lee informs the Chancellor that according to the royal patents all the said lands must be granted to himself in fee simple. The Chancellor had no objection, and the respective grants are dated June 25, 19 Elizabeth. The latest manumission by Lee entered in the documents which I could find relates to 41 Elizabeth.

It is very well known that in theory all lands and goods of the villein belonged to the lord. It was through the lord's negligence or favour if his rights over his bondman's property were not enforced. But some modern writers affirm that this right of the lord became quite obsolete in the sixteenth century. Mr. Hall thinks that the lords had long ceased to make use of their seignorial rights, and even Elizabethan inquisitions appraising the bondmen's property are in his opinion no proof to the contrary.[1] Mr. Page assures us that before the end of the fifteenth century the villein became as safe against the arbitrary seizure of his possessions by the lord as the small freeholder.[2] The conditions of the enfranchisement in the sixteenth century must be cited against this optimistic view, and the instructive episode of the manumissions by Sir H. Lee reveals to the reader the grim reality of the legal theory of villeinage. The lord loses all he had in the villein, and the price which the manumitted bondman is prepared or compelled to pay for the freedom is a very good criterion of what he gains by getting rid of serfdom. In the middle of the sixteenth century the Court of Augmentations required a third part of the villein's property as a reasonable payment for the charter of enfranchisement. I shall show presently

[1] *Society in Elizabethan Age*, 33–36 (1886).
[2] *End of Villeinage*, pp. 97, 98.

that nearly the same percentage of the possessions of the manumitted bondmen was exacted in a Lincolnshire manor under Elizabeth. The rights of the lord over the bondman's lands and goods could not be perfectly obsolete at the time when so heavy a fine was taken for the manumission.

In the above-quoted records of the Duchy of Lancaster the documents referring to the manumissions by Lee are followed by a survey of the villeins in the manor of Long Bennington, Lincolnshire, dated April 18, 12 Elizabeth. There are four parts of the survey : names of many (but not all) bondmen, lands of all bondmen with yearly values, inventories of movable goods of all bondmen, and excerpts from the Court Rolls proving the villein status of many bondmen. Many notes are made on the margins and between the lines in two later hands. The most numerous and most important of them are written in one hand, in the third part of the survey, and refer to payments for manumission. I compared the inventories with the manumissions by Sir Henry Lee relating to the manor of Long Bennington, and in many cases it proved perfectly clear that the bondmen whose inventories were made in 12 Elizabeth were manumitted by Lee in 17–22 Elizabeth. It is highly probable that the notes about the payment for enfranchisement belong to the episode with Lee, and it is possible that they were written by Lee himself. He could take the recently made survey as a guide, and against every name inscribe his remarks.

Two brothers named Gilbert, Thomas and Robert, were the richest bondmen in the manor. Robert had one customary mease, two oxgangs of the Queen's demesnes and half a mill in Bennington, and certain free lands in Foston. Besides, he bought the reversion of a large farm in Dodington, consisting of nine oxgangs and of one close, of the inheritance of L. Lefton, gent., to enter at Michaelmas, 1571, for twenty-one years, at the yearly payment of 3*l.* He was worth in goods 199*l.* 3*s.* 4*d.*, and two persons owed him 14*l.* 7*s.* 4*d.* He left two sons under age, and his chattels remained in the hands of his brother Thomas. Thomas sold a mease in fee simple for

10*l.* and bought certain free lands in Upton, Notts, which were let for 4*l.* yearly. In a later marginal note it is said that he bought six oxgangs for 160*l.*, besides he held for eight years jointly with T. Statharne eight oxgangs and three closes in Westborough and Dodington Fields. His goods were valued at 141*l.* 1*s.* 4*d.*, but with the explanation that a great part of them consisted of the chattels of his late brother Robert, so that the same goods might be counted twice. Four later notes state the payments for manumission. 'The children of R. Gilbert to pay out of their porcion for the manumission 100 markes for them and all their children.' Even this large sum seemed insufficient to a later official who has added *plus oportet.* Thomas Gilbert was requested to pay 60*l.* for his enfranchisement, but again *plus oportet* stands above the figure. Another bondman of the same name, Michael Gilbert of Long Bennington, was also very well off. He held five customary oxgangs, two free oxgangs, four oxgangs of the Queen's demesnes, and 'one whole parte of milnes.' His goods were valued at 52*l.* 15*s.* 8*d.* A note conveys the details of his fine for manumission: 'he offered tene pondes, he may well pay 40 marks for him and all his children.' The Gilberts were among the first bondmen manumitted by Lee: their charters are dated April–June, 17 Elizabeth.

More than thirty-three villein families are named in the survey, and the heads of seven of them are substantial tenants holding many oxgangs and for the most part enjoying a considerable movable property. The high percentage of well-off people among the last bondmen is remarkable: it occurs in many other places and deserves some attention. Of the remaining bondmen seven or eight were considerable tenants holding four or five oxgangs, worth yearly thirty to fifty shillings. It is not in all cases possible to ascertain what were their movables and their fines for enfranchisement.[1] Three cases are clear.

There are very few tenants with the typical villein holding of a virgate or an oxgang. One held three oxgangs, two held one oxgang each, one only half an oxgang. One held some

[1] In one case we have the note, 'This is an honest pore man.'

free lands worth 10*s.*, and six were mere cottiers or very small tenants-at-will. All the rest held no lands at all and were extremely poor. Two of them are called in the survey 'very poore men havinge nothinge to live uppon;' their movables were worth 51*s.* and 39*s.* Four more bondmen without land had less than three pounds' worth in movables. None of these landless and indigent bondmen were manumitted by Lee for obvious reasons.

Many of these villeins had lost almost all vital connexion with the manor and the village community. It is strange that three of them were curates in neighbouring counties, and the survey, in full agreement with legal theory, makes no difference between these parsons and the other bondmen.[1] The jurors had lost all trace of one bondman. They heard that he was villein regardant to the manor and that he had died of late, but what goods he left they did not know. The jurors could also say nothing about another deceased bondman, but a speculative search was rewarded by finding that he 'dyed rich by marying of a wydoo sister of Isacke of London.'

One conclusion is certain. The economic foundation of serfdom, the farming of demesnes with the labour services of the villeins, had disappeared, and we do not hear of any week-work in Long Bennington. The village community, with its open fields and its equality of holdings, was in a state of disintegration. Many bondmen became landless paupers, and what they lived upon the local jurors themselves could not say. Others, on the contrary, concentrated in their hands a considerable number of tenements and held them partly in separate closes. The villeins continued to be called 'regardant to the manor,' but for many the term became a legal fiction. Three were parsons attached to their parish much more than

[1] 'W. Bainbrigg, clerk, beinge a curate of Norwiche.' The later note says: 'hath a manumission dated 4 Jan. 1 Mary cum sigillo Edwardi VI.' 'Th. Baynbrigge of Shortsome, clerk and curate, 3 myles from Norwiche.' The later note adds 'pauper. R. Rushall of Elton, Notts, curate there, and there of late deceased.' He held two free meases in Foston, four customary oxgangs, and one oxgang of bordland. His sister's children were his heirs. On the villein clergy see Litt. s. 202 = Co. Lit. 135 *b*–136 *b*.

to their manor. One was totally lost sight of. The survey gives few details about the occupations of bondmen. Were it otherwise we should certainly hear, as in other places, of villeins who became artisans and apprentices. The seignorial element of the manorial system, the personal dependence of the serf on the lord, survived on its agrarian and communal side. The lord watched carefully over the due payments of heriot, merchet, chevage, and fines for admittance. The last bondmen were reminded from time to time that in certain respects they were still at the lord's mercy. But even the personal element of serfdom, which proved more lasting than its territorial basis, underwent important modifications. The personal dependence of the bondman became a mere pretext for extortion. With the decay of demesne farming the person of the serf became of little importance; but it was still possible to get or squeeze out of him a certain amount of cash. The mark of later villeinage was that bondmen were compelled to give money to the lord on certain occasions, while free-born people had nothing to pay. But the lord was even more anxious to get hold of the bondman's property than his person. This is the reason why so many Elizabethan inventories of bondmen's lands and goods are preserved. This also explains the curious fact that the preponderant majority of the last bondmen were either well off or paupers, and that the 'middle class' of villeins got their freedom at an earlier period. The poor remained bond because they had nothing to give for their enfranchisement. As to the rich, the lords were not prepared to sell their charters of manumission; it was more profitable to await the incidents connected with their tenure to demand a large heriot, or merchet, or fine of admittance.

Already in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries some villens had attained a considerable social position.[1] In the

[1] Three curious examples are adduced by Pollock and Maitland, i. 432. Professor Petrushevsky, pp. 335–7, quotes another instance from the Patent Rolls of R. II. p. 2, m. 21: the lord, the Prior of Ely, has impounded the cattle of John Reve, villein of the manor of 'Sutton, to the value of 100*l*. Instances in the

manor of Forncett wealthy villeins occur in the account roll of 1378.

In later times well-to-do bondmen become more numerous. In the same manor of Forncett lived the bond family Dosy. One Dosy died in 1441 seised of 52 acres and five messuages. His son died in 1487 seised of 60 acres. In 1500 there were three tenants of this name. One was poor and had but five acres. The second died seised of 110 acres. The third held eight messuages and 86 acres; his eldest son was manumitted in 1556, and probably paid 120*l.* for his charter. A member of another bond family in the manor held lands in 1524 which were worth yearly 40*l.*, and his two sons-in-law kept several servants. We have seen before how an Elizabethan Mayor of Bristol and his rich brother were claimed as villeins by Lord Stafford. The bond family of Alweyes, in Colern, Wilts, belonged under Henry VIII. to New College, Oxford. Great personages appear as suitors before the Warden of this college to treat for their manumission—Sir H. Long, the Bishop of Winchester, the Archbishop of Canterbury. In 29 Henry VIII. Cromwell himself writes about them to the Warden. The Warden promises to do as much as he can, but adds that the statutes of the College forbid them to alienate lands and bondmen. His further remarks show that one of the latter was the most considerable tenant in Colern. 'The chefe of the Alweyes, reve and overseer of my college wood, wastes the woods and conceals the rents. He has our best holding in Colern.'[1]

In 9–10 Henry VIII. in the manor of Idmiston, Wilts, the reeve was also a bondman. He must have been a man of substance, because he farmed the demesne, arable and meadow, amounting to 534 acres.[2] In 1 Richard III. three servants of the Bishop of Ely brought a complaint in Chancery against T. Hunston, who, they said, in an ancient suit was

case of Forncett occur in Miss Davenport's article in *Trans. Roy. Hist. Soc.* xiv. 123–142.

[1] Gairdner, xiii. 324, Febr. 29 H. VIII.

[2] Hoare *v.* Hundred of Alderbury, pp. 67–72.

proved to be a villein regardant to the bishop's manor of St. Gyles Tydde. When the bishop (Morton) fell into disgrace at Court, Hunston commenced an action before the King's Bench, claiming from the bishop 300*l.* damages which he had suffered because he was frightened by the bishop's threats and dared not openly go to his business. The bishop's servants complain that Hunston bribed the jury when the issue of his villein status came before the country.[1]

A most interesting example of a rich villein family occurs in the middle of the fifteenth century in the manor of Castle Combe, Wiltshire.[2] The Heynes were large wool manufacturers and natives of blood at the same time. William died in 1435, and his property was valued at 3,000 marks. The homage called to verify this inquisition declared upon their oaths that after the payment of funeral expenses, debts, and special bequests the remainder of the property did not exceed 300 marks. But the subsequent exactions of the lord raise a suspicion that the homage were not quite sincere in their verdict. The lord levied a fine of sixty marks for permission to the widow Margery Heyne to have possession of the remainder. In 1437 Margery married Edward Jones, and she ought to pay 100*l.* to the lord for the permission to marry. However, the exactions did not stop there. In 1442 Margery and Edward Jones paid a renewed fine of 40*l.* In 1443 Margery paid another fine of 60*l.* for the licence to possess her goods and tenements. She died in 1455, and her son Thomas Heyne, to get possession of her property, paid 4*l.* as fine of admittance. He bought his manumission in 1463. It seems that he paid for it 20*l.* In less than thirty years the lords squeezed at least 264*l.* out of this family. The fact proves both the wealth of some villeins and the insecurity of their possession.

It is curious that the title 'yeoman,' which is generally regarded as a special designation of freemen, was sometimes

[1] *Calendar of Elizabethan Chancery Proceedings*, i. p. cxiii.

[2] The story is told by Scrope in the *History of Castle Combe*, pp. 223–6.

applied to bondmen. Two yeomen were manumitted under Elizabeth.[1]

Thus men of substance were more numerous among the last bondmen than might be supposed; but they were few in comparison with the paupers. The proof is to be found in some Exchequer and Duchy of Lancaster Special Commissions issued under Elizabeth. Ten bondmen were presented by the oaths of free tenants at Leominster in 21 Elizabeth. Nothing is said about their lands. One was worth in goods 10*l.*, the second 6*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*, the third 3*l.* The rest were worth 'little' or 'very little,' some of them probably much less than 3*l.* The eleventh bondman was manumitted later. It is suggestive that he was the only man of sufficient means to pay for his freedom. He held, jointly with a freeman, the whole manor of Assheton, worth, deducting all charges, 13*l.*[2]

In the manor of Martham, Norfolk, in 18 Elizabeth, two bond families of considerable means claimed manumission. Only one of the remaining six villein families was well-to-do. Four of them were extremely poor.[3]

In the manor of Estherdam, Norfolk, three bondmen were worth very little in lands and goods. One was an apprentice dwelling outside the manor. The fourth family had some means, but they claimed to have a manumission. The sons left the manor and became artisans. One was a saddler and the other a tanner.[4]

We find precisely the same conditions in the manor of Spalding in Lincolnshire. Three bondmen were poor in 19 Elizabeth, but a bondwoman held four messuages with appurtenances; and all these lands were worth yearly 12*l.* after paying all charges. It was a fortune for a peasant.[5]

[1] *Duchy of Lanc. Miscellanea*, $\frac{18}{20}$; *Duchy of Lanc. Miscellanea*, v. 102.

[2] Exch. Queen's Rem. Spec. Comm. n. 7067. Hugh Wind is the name of the manumitted bondman.

[3] *Ib.* n. 1551.

[4] *Ib.* nn. 1637, 1554. John Style died worth very little in goods and seised of one acre of freehold. But his son Martin was doing well: he acquired one tenement and four acres of copyhold, worth, allowing for all charges, 33*s.* 4*d.*

[5] Exch. Queen's Rem. Spec. Comm. n. 2046.

Fifteen bondmen were presented by the free tenants in Kingston Lacy, Dorset, in 18 Elizabeth. Six were tenants. two held small plots only, and the inquisition states emphatically that all these bondmen had no goods.[1]

But the most striking instances come from two Lincolnshire manors in 14 Elizabeth. Eight villeins remained in Waythall. Six are called labourers; the seventh, twelve years old, was in service before he fell ill; the eighth was probably also a labourer. All were landless. The goods of the richest were worth 3*l.* Two had no goods and lived from the poor-box. Six had children, but the families were small; the largest had four children. Five villeins remained in Little Steping, all labourers. They had no lands and no goods. Four were bachelors; the fifth had no issue.[2] These last bondmen were evidently in the condition of paupers.

The results of historical study are contained in the evidence used; they are given and limited by it. But perhaps I may be allowed to say a few words in conclusion.

The villeins of the sixteenth century formed a very small part of the rural population, and in this sense, but only in this sense, the later villeinage may be called antiquated. But the study of the subject is by no means devoid of real interest. It is useful to know that the decay of the manorial system did not bring with it immediately the abolition of villeinage. Personal serfdom proved to be stronger than demesne farming and the system of village community itself. The last bondmen did no week-work and very little boon-work or *averagia*. Often they went into towns and became artisans or merchants. But the heavy hand of the lord weighed upon them everywhere. They would have been astonished i anybody had told them that their serfdom was a mere shadow of the past and a mere antiquarian survival. They would have pointed out that they must apply to the lord for licence to leave or to marry; that they must pay heriots and

[1] Duchy of Lanc. Spec. Comm., n. 258, membrane 2.
[2] Duchy of Lanc. Spec. Comm., n. 258, membrane 1.

fines of admission; that the steward could in many ways interfere with their lives. They would have reminded us that for their charter of freedom they had to sacrifice one quarter or one third of their lands and goods, and that many a neighbour would not give his daughter to a villein's son until he had bought his freedom.

Their serfdom was indeed keenly felt by the last bondmen, and this must be taken into serious consideration by anybody who desires to understand their condition. But the importance of the later villeinage was not confined to the bondmen. I have been led to it by a study of copyholds, and I am convinced that the question throws considerable light on the status of the copyholders. In the sixteenth century many freemen of to-day were the villeins of yesterday; and if we find so much of sad reality in the villeinage of the Tudor age, is it not perfectly natural to look for traces of their recent serfdom in the melancholy history of the customary tenants?

APPENDIX

BONDMEN OF THE TUDOR PERIOD

County	Manor	Date	Number of Families	Evidence
Bedfordshire	Cranfield	19 Eliz.	1	Exch. Q. R. Spec. Comm. n. 2046 [1]
Cambridgeshire	St. Giles Tydde	1 R. III.	1	Cal. of Eliz. Chanc. Proc. v. 1, p. c. xiii.
—	Wilburton	6-7 H. VII.	Many	Engl. Hist. R. ix. 437 (Maitland)
Cornwall [2]	Stoke Clymynslande	6 H. VIII.	2 m.	Pat. 6 H. VIII. p. 1, m. 31 = Rymer, xiii. 470 = Brewer, i. 5694

[1] In 19 Eliz. this family was almost extinct—only one woman survived. The manuscript custumal of the manor, kindly given me by Mr. Seebohm, shows that there were bondwomen in the manor in 1484.

[2] I am in doubt about the manor of Tewington, Cornwall. See the well-known Concanen's report of Rowe *v.* Brenton, 167, 169, 170, 180. The tenants in the Ministers' Accounts of 22–23 H. VII. and of 39–40 Eliz. are divided into free and conventionaries. The latter again are divided into free and *natives*. But as I find once the expression 'our natives or tenants in bondage' (p. 180) it is not impossible that these natives were personally free.

County	Manor	Date	Number of Families	Evidence
Cornwall	Helston on Trigg	19 Eliz.	3 m.	N. and Q. 5 Series, i. 36
Derbyshire	Holmesfield	9 H. VII.	2	Journ. Derb. Arch. Soc. xx. 62, 73
—	—	21 H. VII.	1	—
Devonshire	Bradenyche	14 H. VIII.	1 m.	Brewer, iii. 2992, n. 14 = Pat. 14 H. VIII. p. 2, m. 17
—	Holne	26 H. VIII.	1 p.m.	Proc. Court Requests b. 12, n. 7 = Seld. Soc. iii. 48–59 [1]
Dorset	Warnehall	About 24 H. VIII.	9	Hearne, Langtoft, 343–388 = Dugdale, i. 10–21
—	Shapwyke	1 Eliz.	1	Duchy of Lanc. Spec. Comm. n. 7
—	Kingston Lacy	3–8 E. IV.	1	Rotuli Parl. v. 535 *b*, 610 *b*
—	—	1 H. VII.	1 m.	Campbell, i. 603 = L. R. 188 *b*
—	—	6 E. VI.	2	Duchy of Lanc. Misc. b. v. 108, f. 40, 43
—	—	4 Eliz.	1	Duchy of Lanc. Spec. Comm. n. 55
—	—	5–7 Eliz.	3 m.	D. of Lanc. Miscellanea, $\frac{13}{20}$
—	—	7 Eliz.	2	D. of Lanc. Spec. Comm. n. 122
—	—	18 Eliz.	17 [2]	D. of Lanc. Spec. Comm. n. 258, m. 2
—	—	19 Eliz.	1 m.	D. of Lanc. Misc. Books, v. 102
Essex	High Easter	11 Eliz.	7+2 m [3]	D. of Lanc. Spec. Comm. n. 185 = 191, 190
—	—	19 Eliz.	3 [4]	D. of Lanc. Misc. Books, v. 102
Gloucestershire	Alkington	H. VII.	1 m.	Berkeley MSS. iii. 43 (John Smyth) [5]
—	Bath Abbey estates	22 H. VIII.	1	Harl. MS. 3970, f. 37 = Cunningham, i. 402, n. 5
—	Thornebury	5 H. VII.	1	Archæologia, xxv. 320
—	Idem and other manors	13 H. VIII.	Many	Brewer, iii. 1286 [6]

[1] In this case the plaintiff's ancestor received manumission in 1478, but the defendant denies its validity.

[2] But some of them were already manumitted at this time: the Mackerells and one of the Payne families (see in *D. of Lanc. Miscellanea*, $\frac{13}{20}$, their manumission of 5 and of 7 Eliz.)

[3] But the date of manumission is not given.

[4] But out of three families only one woman, Margery (born Smith), now Poole, is stated to be alive.

[5] It is the description of the Hundred of Berkeley written by the old Smyth in the thirties of the seventeenth century. The passage is interesting: 'In this manor or tithenge (of Alkington), and in all or most of this hundred, the lords therof have had divers villeins or bondservants . . . until the time of our last civill warres between the houses of Yorke and Lancaster; of whom I have seen many sales and grants by divers deeds, some of whom continued till end E. IV., and beginninge of H. VII.; when the last manumission was by William lord Berkeley in this manor.'

[6] Brewer gives here an abstract of the document called 'the survey of the lands of the duke of Buckingham, executed.' The passages about the bondmen are these: '. . . In some manors are woods and bondmen. . . . Of bondmen there is a good number in Thornebury, as appears by the court rolls.'

County	Manor	Date	Number of Families	Evidence
Gloucestershire	Idem and other manors	17 H.VIII.	1 m.	Brewer, iv. 2132 = Pat. 17 H. VIII. p. 2, m. 11
—	—	28 Eliz.	Many	Dasent, xiv. 48, 100, 153, 190; xv. 69, 303 [1]
Hampshire	Manydown	1345–1496	Many manumissions	Kitchin, Manydown, 101–3 [2]
—	Basingstoke	28 H.VIII.	2 m.	Gairdner, xi. 1417, 14 = Pat. 28 H. VIII. p. 4, m. 1
—	Tytchefelde	29 H.VIII.	'Some'	Gairdner, xiii. 151
—	Hentone	30 H.VIII.	2	Kitchin, St. Swithun's Compotus Rolls, 142 (Hampshire Record Series, 1822)
—	Alresford and Sutton	5 E. VI.	Many	D. of L. Rent and Surv. $\frac{8}{22}$, pp. 15, 16 [3]
—	Langestoke	6 E. VI.	1	D. of Lanc. Misc. B. v. 108, f. 8
Herefordshire	Leominster	21 Eliz.	11 (1 m.)	Exch. Q. Rem. Spec. Comm. n. 7067
Hertfordshire	St. Alban's Abbey, 10 manors	1465–1483	18 m.	Reg. Abbatiæ St[i] Albani, ii. passim (Rolls Series) [4]
Huntingdonshire	Weston	32 H.VIII.	1	Dugdale, Mon. ii. 589
Kent (?)	Milton	8 H. IV.	5 m.	Arch. Cantiana, xii. 285 [5]

[1] The matter is obscure. The lord of the manor, Lord Stafford, 'claims many persons as villeins regardant to the manor of Thornebury and tries to sease their bodyes.' The Mayor of Bristol and his brother are of the number. The defendants pretend to be freemen.

[2] 'The St. Swithun's Cathedral Enrolment Book,' which runs from 1345 to 1496, contains a large number of manumissions of the natives, averaging about one a year during the whole period. They are most frequent in the latter part of the fifteenth century. Kitchin (pp. 101–103, 222) quotes also five fifteenth-century entries about the particular villeins from the Court Rolls and Compotus Rolls of the manor. The latest quotation relates to 1462.

[3] One of the articles of the survey was: 'Item a boke of the names of the bondmen and lett them be also presentyd at the court.' The surveyor, Anthony Browne, answered: 'Thay [=the jury] have presentyd same, but thay cannot remember all and as many as tary within the Lordesshypp thay have not presentyd. The names must be presentyd for Sutton and Hethley and Rapley at more leasure. For the names of them that dwell and tarye in the Libertye ar not presentyd, but only such as by fyne and lycens do dwell abrode and make yerelye recognicon.'

[4] I have included these manumissions of Edward IV.'s time. They show a considerable number of villeins living on the St. Albans Abbey estates during the Wars of the Roses, and it is by no means clear that all of them attained freedom before Henry VII. 'Chronica Monasterii S. Albani' does not go further than 1485. It is interesting that there is no single manumission in 1452–1464 in the 'Registrum Whethamstede' (*ib.* vol. i.). It is not altogether impossible that Abbot Whethamstede did not care to enter manumissions. But it is much more probable that he did not manumit the villeins of the abbey: he was a staunch guardian of old seignorial rights, so far as we can judge from the instructive incident with the mill in 1455 (*id.* i. 199–202).

[5] I have made use of this early case because, considering the local peculiarities, the Kentish villeins are especially interesting. However, the Kentish origin of these villeins is not perfectly certain. The document quoted is a manumission by will,

County	Manor	Date	Number of Families	Evidence
Kent .	Romney	19 H.VIII.	Number uncertain [1]	Brewer. iv. 3447
Lincoln-shire	Bolingbroke	1 H. VII.	1 extinct	Campbell, i. 474
—	Bardenay	17 H. VII.	1 m.	Dugdale, Mon. i. 638
—	Scotter	11 H.VIII.	1	Archæologia, xlvi. 373
—	Waithall	14 Eliz.	9	D. of Lanc. Spec. Comm. n. 258, m. 1
—	—	15 Eliz.	1 m.	D. of Lanc. Misc. $\frac{13}{20}$
—	Little Stepinge	2 Eliz.	8	D. of Lanc. Spec. Comm. n. 30
—	—	3 Eliz.	8 m.	D. of Lanc. Misc. $\frac{13}{20}$
—	—	14 Eliz.	5	D. of Lanc. Spec. Comm. n. 258, m. 1
—	—	18 Eliz.	2 m.	D. of Lanc. Misc. Books, v. 102
—	Ingoldmelles	2 Eliz.	1	D. of Lanc. Spec. Comm. n. 20
—	—	11 Eliz.	1 m.	D. of Lanc. Misc. $\frac{13}{20}$
—	—	17–19 Eliz.	4 m.	D. of Lanc. Misc. B. v. 102
—	—	Elizabeth	4 m.	D. of Lanc. Misc. $\frac{13}{20}$
—	Spaldinge	29 H.VIII.	10	D. of Lanc. Spec. Comm. n. 258, m. 8
—	—	19 Eliz.	4	Exch. Q. R. Spec. Comm. n. 2046
—	Long Bennington	12 Eliz.	33	D. of Lanc. Misc. $\frac{13}{19}$
—	—	17–22 Eliz.	25 (23 m.)	D. of Lanc. Misc. B. v. 102
Norfolk .	Hokham Magna	30 H.VIII.	1 m.	Gairdner, xiii. 2, 1028
—	Kenninghall	33 H.VIII.	1	East Anglian, iii. 377
—	Forncett	1400–1412	21	Davenport, Tr. R.H.S. xiv. 123–42, especially 131–2 & 141 [2]
—	—	1563–1575	3	
—	Martham	18 Eliz.	8 p.m.	Exch. Q. R. Spec. Comm. n. 1551
—	Walpole	18 Eliz.	2 p.m.	Exch. Q. R. Spec. Comm. n. 1637
—	Westwalton	18 Eliz.	17 p.m.	Exch. Q. R. Spec. Comm. n. 1552
—	Estderham	18 Eliz.	3	Exch. Q. R. Spec. Comm. n. 1554, 1637
—	Gimingham	4 Eliz.	2	H. Hall, 158 (Soc. in Eliz. age)

Will of Sir W. Septvans of Milton, near Canterbury: 'Item lego A. Stanford, J. Hamonde, R. Handerd, R. Chirche et J. Richesforde, servis et nativis meis, plenam libertatem et volo quod quilibet eorum habeat cartam manumissionis.'

[1] These bondmen ('R. Mors and others') are plaintiffs in the case Mors *v.* Duchess of Buckingham.

[2] This interesting monograph about the manor of Forncett gives much valuable information on the decay of villeinage. The number of the villein population decreases slowly but constantly. In 1400 sixteen servile families were tenants of the manor (besides five other families are mentioned in the Court Rolls that did not hold any land of, but were villeins regardant to, the manor). In 1500 not more than eight families; in 1525 only five; in 1550 only three; and after that no more villein *tenants* are mentioned in the rolls. But in 1563 a bondwoman purchased a license to marry, and in 1575 'two or three' serfs still paid their yearly chevage.

County	Manor	Date	Number of Families	Evidence
Norfolk .	Gimingham	6 Eliz.	1	D. of Lanc. Spec. Comm. n. 106
—	—	8 Eliz.	2 m.	D. of Lanc. Misc. $\frac{13}{20}$
—	—	9 Eliz.	1	D. of Lanc. Spec. Comm. n. 157
—	—	17–41 Eliz.	19 (14 m.)	D. of Lanc. Misc. B. v. 102 [1]
Notting-hamshire	Farneton	17 Eliz.	1 m.	D. of Lanc. Misc. B. v. 102
—	Gringley	Elizabeth	1 m.	D. of Lanc. Misc. $\frac{13}{20}$
Oxfordshire	Spellesbury	3 and 9 Eliz.	2	J. Jordan, Hist. of Euston, pp. 310, 311 (1857)
Rutland .	Langham	17 H. VIII.	1 m.	Brewer, iv. 1610, 21 = Pat. 17 H. VIII. p. 2, m. 6
Somerset-shire	Many	About 24 H. VIII.	215	T. Langtoft's Chronicle, ed. Hearne (1725), pp. 343–88 [2]
—	Taunton Dean	14 Eliz.	1 m.	Rymer, xv. 715 = Pat. 14 Eliz. p. 9, m. 15
—	Long Ashton	23 Eliz.	1 m.	Notes and Queries, 8 Ser. ix. 446 [3]
Suffolk .	Kelsall	31 Eliz.	2	Exch. Q. R. Misc. B. v. 46, f. 246
Sussex .	Falmer	15 Jac. I.	3	Notes and Queries, 1 Ser. i. 139 [4]
Warwick-shire	Barkiswell	25 H. VIII.	1 m.	Gairdner, vii. 147, 5 = Pat. 25 H. VIII. p. 1, m. 32

[1] The bulk of the evidence in this case relates to 17–19 Eliz. Two villein families were manumitted in 41 Eliz., and only one family, Kye or Collet, out of the nineteen is not mentioned in the evidence of 17–19 Eliz. Out of eighteen families referred to in 17–19 Eliz. twelve received manumission during these two years.

[2] It is the well-known 'survey of the lately attainted lands of the monastery of Glastonbury by Pollard and Moyle.' The manuscript was in the Bodleian, Ainter Rot. A great part of it was printed also by Dugdale, *Mon.* i. 10–21. Dugdale gives a larger number of villein families (227 instead of 215). Ten manors are named separately with the following numbers of villein families: 14 + 15 + 7 + 2 + 22 + 1 + 1 + 17 + 7 + 11. But the remainder of the bond population, 118 families, are not distributed by manors.

[3] It is a manumission by will. The will was made by H. Smyth, of Long Ashton, Somerset, on February 27.

[4] As the reference shows, the entry is already printed in *N. and Q.* Being, as far as I am aware, the latest certain mention of bondmen by blood in a manorial survey, the case is of exceptional interest, and I beg for allowance to reprint the entry for the convenience of the reader. The passage is taken from Norden's manuscript 'Survey of certain crown manors.' 'There are three bondmen of bloude belonginge unto this manor, never known to be anie way manumissed, namely Thomas, William, John Goringe. Thomas dwells at Amberley, William at Piddinghow, John at Rottingdean. What goods they have the jurie knowe not. All poor men. Thomas has the reversion of a cotage now in the tenure of W. Jeffreye. But mee thinks this kind of advantage is nowe out of season; yet, were they men of ability, they might be, upon some consideracion, infraunchized.' However, it is possible that villeins remained even later in the forest of Pickering (see p. 242, above).

County	Manor	Date	Number of Families	Evidence
Wiltshire [1]	8 manors	About 24 H. VIII.	33	Langtoft, ed. Hearne, 343–88 [2]
—	Damerham	9–10 H. VIII.	10	Hoare *v.* Hundred of South Damerham, 40–65
—	Idmiston	9–10 H. VIII.	7	Hoare *v.* Hundred of Alderbury, 67–72
—	—	About 24 H. VIII.	18	Langtoft, ed. Hearne, 343–88
—	Colern	29 H. VIII.	1	Gairdner, xiii. 1, 324
Worcestershire	Yardeley	3 H. VIII.	1	Brewer, i. 1719 = Pat. 3 H. VIII. p. 1, m. 15
—	—	14 H. VIII.	1	Brewer, iii. 2356, 7 = Pat. 14 H. VIII. p. 1, m. 4
—	—	About the same time	1	Star Chamber Proc. H. VIII. b. 32, n. 97 [3]
Yorkshire.	Burstwyke	25 H. VIII.	3	Gairdner, vi. 1383, 2 = Pat. 25 H. VIII. p. 1, m. 16

CASES WHERE IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO FIX THE LOCALITY

Name of the Lord	Date	Number	Evidence
—	11 H. VII.	1	Y.B. 11 H. VII. 13
Duke of Buckingham	10 H. VIII.	1 m.	Brewer, iii. 1285
Earl of Arundel	20 H. VIII.	1	Gairdner, xiii. 1, 1263
Butler (Somersetshire)	9–11 Eliz.	1	Dyer, Rep. 266 *b*, 283 [4]

[1] In the manor of Castle Combe, Wilts, as late as 1476, there were evidently many villeins. I read in the Court Roll of the year : ' Preceptum est nativo homagio ibidem habere hic ad proximam Willelmum Newman, nativum domini de sanguine, commorantem cum Th. Bokeler apud Foxcote, sub pena 6*s.* 8*d.*' (Scrope, *Hist. of Castle Combe*, p. 325).

[2] The bond families are distributed by manors in the following manner : 6+2+2+1+1+1+18. The manor of Idmiston (and what of Damerham?) is in the number.

[3] It is a curious case. One John Middelmore has taken and hidden seventy-one pieces of evidence proving the bond estate of the Woods. Some trick was suspected. The bailiff complains that it has been done ' by roial power.'

[4] I do not adduce the last case where the plaintiff claimed the defendant as his villein regardant (Noy, *Rep.* 27 Hil. 15 Jac. I., Common Bench), because eventually it was found that the defendant was of free condition, though it is not quite clear upon what ground. Hargrave (Somersett's case, 33–4) attributes the decision to the want of service by the claimant during sixty years ; his interpretation of the report is very probable, but not certain. Hargrave (*l.c.*) quotes two more cases of pleading villeinage : Coke's *Entries*, 406 *b*, Hil. 18 Eliz. ; Hughes's *Abr.* tit. Villeinage, 23 Trin. 8 Jac. I. I could not verify the quotations. There are many other cases in the Year Books and the Reports of the Tudor age where one party to the suit is claimed as of villein condition. But as I do not know whether the claim be true, I could not use them for numerical purposes. Some of them are discussed in another connexion. Even concerning the only report I made use of in the text I have to state a limitation. It was found by the Court that the defendant became of free condition because the plaintiff and his ancestors had no seisin of him and his ancestors during sixty years. Thus the defendant ceased to be a bondman some time before the suit. I shall discuss in another connexion the interesting case of the Welsh bondmen.

DISCUSSION

Dr. P. Vinogradoff expressed his pleasure at having heard such an interesting communication on the subject of bondage in the Tudor period, especially as it augured well for Mr. Savine's forthcoming work on the Social Condition of England in the Sixteenth Century. The main and new point in Mr. Savine's essay was the point about the manumissions. Their substantial importance and influence on the disappearance of bondmen were brought out strongly in regard to the Tudor age. Still it would be very wrong to suppose that the general decline of personal bondage, which is noticeable at much earlier times, has to be attributed chiefly to the spread of manumissions. The principal cause of its decay is undoubtedly the progress of contractual and commercial relations and the consequent mobilisation of the rural class, if one may use the expression.

The frequent changes of abode, the multifarious relations based on hire, loosened the grasp of the lords over their bondmen and led to the evaporation of bondage and its characteristic marks, quite apart from formal manumissions.

Dr. Vinogradoff also suggested, in regard to the optimistic statements of Harrison and Sir Thomas Smith on servitude in England, that these statements may be partly accounted for by the supposition that the abovementioned authors had in their minds comparisons between England on the one hand, ancient Rome and contemporary France and Germany on the other.

Dr. Seebohm, whilst acknowledging the value and interest of the evidence of manumissions as proof of the lingering survivals of serfdom, thought that the interest of the subject would have been greatly increased if Mr. Savine's researches into the connexion of serfdom with copyhold tenure could have

been given also, so many of the survivals of serfdom being connected with the tenure. He confirmed Dr. Vinogradoff's view that the gradual disappearance of serfdom, except in isolated cases, was more the result of economic influences than of legislation. Happily English judges from the first had held that the services were fixed by custom, and applied the same rule to the money payments in lieu of them which between the Conquest and the Black Death had become general. The fact that the money payments were fixed at what was a fair equivalent for the services of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries resulted in their becoming from economic causes by the sixteenth century a hardly appreciable charge. The instance was alluded to of Prince Llewelyn's dues from Aberfraw being roughly one sixth of the value of the cattle of his dependents at the time of the English conquest of North Wales, whereas the same money payments in 1600 represented about one hundredth of the value of the same number of cattle in the prices of the later date. The yearly value of an acre of land in the fourteenth century was commonly reckoned at 4*d.* per acre, but this had become a quite insignificant charge to the copyholder of the Tudor period; and we have only to contrast with the English copyholder's position that of the German peasant at the time of the Peasants' War, whose services had not been commuted, to understand how much our English copyholders had gained by the very different judicial treatment and economic course of things in this country. He hoped that before long we should have the benefit of Mr. Savine's investigations upon the later history of copyhold tenure.

Mr. Leadam concurred with the opinion of the previous speakers that the disappearance of villeinage was only secondarily due to direct acts of manumission. He thought that the transfer of ownership at the Dissolution probably assisted it, the crown being traditionally in favour of liberty and, as the records of the two prerogative courts—the

Courts of Requests and of the Star Chamber—show, constantly ready to support tenants against landlords. But Mr. Savine was mistaken in supposing that the Court of Requests was established to protect villeins. It was called in the time of Henry VII. the 'Court of Poor Men's Causes.' Moreover villeins, or alleged villeins, laid complaints before the Star Chamber also. The volume of Star Chamber cases of the reign of Henry VII., published by the Selden Society, gives a striking example in Carter *v.* the Abbot of Malmesbury of the abuse which Dr. Page believes had ceased to exist, the seizure of an alleged bondman's property by a lord. In that case too is evidence that as early as the fifteenth century there was a strong sentimental dislike of bondage. Mr. Savine apparently identifies villeins and bondmen, an identification rather of the legal text writers who copied Roman jurists than of customary law, as his quotation from Shaw's 'Staffordshire' indicates. It is in the distinction between the two that he will probably find the link between copyholders and bondmen. A bondman admitted to a customary tenancy was protected by the suitors of the customary court. To adopt the words of the quotation, he ceased, in respect of his tenure, to be *in villenagio* and became *villanus*. It is easy to see how, especially on the estates of absentees, his status soon came to follow his tenure.

INDEX

AARON, Jew of Lincoln, 64
Abbo, Abbot of Ramsey, 28, 29, 30 *n.*
Aberafon, lords of, grant mining rights to monks of Margam, 142
Aberdaron, herring fishery of, 150
Aberfraw, Llewelyn, Prince of, Lord of Snowdon, 131 *n.*
— dues claimed by Llewelyn from, 288
Abergavenny, market of, 150
— mill of, 157 *n.*
Abergele mines, Roman remains in the, 122 *n.*
Abermule (Montgomery), erection of market and castle at, prohibited, 131 *n.*, 164
Aberystwyth, burgesses of, 165
— herring fishery of, 150
— port of, 154 *n.*
Abingdon Abbey, Abbots of: Athelwold, 23–25, 27, 29–31, 34, 35, and *v. sub* Winchester, Bishop of.
— — — — Ethelelmus, 53 *n.*
— — — — Faricius, 46, 54, 58
— — — — Osgar, 29, 30
— — chronicler of, 56
— — continuation of Anglo-Saxon Chronicle by monks of, 39
— — religious houses affiliated to, 29
Acca, Master, King's Agent in Rome, 191
Adames, Jonas, 'Manner of Keeping Court Leet,' by, 243
Addyngton, Parva and Magna, in Northamptonshire, 249 *n.*
Admiralty Office established at Beaumaris, 171
Adscripticii glebæ or *agricensiti*, 239
Adulf, Abbot of Peterborough, *v. sub* Peterborough, Abbot of.
Advanced Historical Study, scheme for, vii, viii
— — — Lectures on, viii
Aelfric, Abbot of Eynsham, *v. sub* Eynsham, Abbot of.
— — — Malmesbury, *v. sub* Malmesbury, Abbot of.
Aelfstan, Bishop of Rochester, *v. sub* Rochester, Bishop of.
Afforci, Tolomeo, Italian banker, 190
Agobard of Lyons, 38
Aid, the New, 200 *n.*
Aigueblanche, Peter of, Bishop of Hereford, 179, 185 *n.*
— — — — — — loans raised by, 207, and *v. sub* Hereford, Bishop of.
Alberici, Messer Uglino, lends money to Richard I., 193
Alcuin, works of, in Glastonbury library, 37, 38
Aldhelm, works of, in Glastonbury library, 37
Alien ships in Welsh ports, 169
Allington (Denbigh), fulling mill in, 157 *n.*
Alnwick, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3
Alsop, Roger, Colonel, regiment of, 77, 89–91, 94–96, 106, 108, 109
Alweye, villein family of manor of Colern (Wilts), 277
Amatori, Teglaro, Florentine merchant, 204

Amici, Bacusboni, Florentine banker, 179
Amiens, 87, 88
Ammanati, Society of Jacopo, merchants of Pistoia, 212
Anderstone (Dorset), inventory of Payne, husbandman of, 253 *n.*
Anglesea, Isle of, 167 *n.*, 170 *n.*
— — — colliery in, 146
— — — escheator of, Richard de Wode, 158
— — — millstones from, 144 *n.*
— — — mines of, 122 *n.*
Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 42, 55
— — kingdom, 38
— — language, 56
Anglo-Saxons, invasions of, 121
Aniane, Benedict of, *v. sub* St. Benedict
Anjou, Charles of, 216
Anketil, Master Robert, 191, 197
Anselm, *v. sub* Canterbury, Archbishops of, and St. Anselm.
Apulia, 178
Arable land in Wales converted into pasture, 138
Arardi, Giuliano Radolfo, lends money to Richard I., 193
Ardern, Philip de, 190
Ardres, relief of, 82
Ardudwy (Merioneth), iron forge at, 147 *n.*
Arithmetic taught in monastic schools, 34
'Arma contra Judeos,' 64 *n.*
Artillery imported from Spain into Wales, 167
Artois, French camp at, 83
Arundel, Richard, Earl of, 171 *n.*
Arwystli (Llanidloes), clothiers from, 159
Ashfield, Colonel, 91
— — reports on Dunkirk garrison, 93
Assheton, manor of, held by a villein, 279
Assize of bread, 249 *n.*
— — roll, 204 *n.*
Asti, 180
Astronomy taught in monastic schools, 34
Athelhelm, Thegn, Odo brought up in the household of, 24
Athelwold, *v. sub* Abingdon, Abbot of, and Winchester, Bishop of
Athlone, siege of, 106
Audenard, Giles de, Keeper of the Tower of London, 212
Augmentations, Court of, 270, 273
— — — Chancellor of, Sir R. Sakevyle, 265
Augustinian canons, 2, 20, 24, 48
— — schools attached to houses of, 51, 52
Austin canons, *v. sub* Augustinian canons
Austria, Don Juan of, 70 *n.*, 72, 75, 85
Averagia, villein services, 280
Avignon, charge for transmission of money to, 189 *n.*
Avon, river, fisheries of the, 149

Bacon, Francis, Lord, discussion of legal status of villeins by, 243
Badelesmere, Bartholomew de, account of, 143 *n.*
Bagaroni, Speroni, banker of Piacenza, 194
Baghegre, lead mines at, 145 *n.*
Bainbrigg, W., villein curate of Norwich, 275 *n.*
Baldwin, Abbot of Bury, physician to William I., 53, and *v. sub* Bury, Abbot of.
Bannor, David ap Eden, 157 *n.*
— Ieuan, 157 *n.*
Barbadoes, Major Bridge sent to the, 110
Barboti, Ranuccio, Italian banker, 192
Bardi, Florentine merchants, export of wool by the, 261 *n.*
— — — loan to Prince Henry by, 187
Bards of Wales, 149
Barkstead, Colonel, 76 *n.*
Barlings, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3, 13
Barmouth, herring fishery of, 150
Barons, the lesser, hostile to the Jews, 64

Basingwerk, monks of, 137
Bath Abbey, lands of, 25, 26
— — monks of, 46, 46 *n.*
— Bishop of, John of Tours, 46
Battle Abbey, monks of, 44
Beadle, William, Lieutenant-Colonel, 77 *n.*
Beauchief, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3, 13
Beaumaris, 141, 170
— Admiralty office at, 171
— English borough of, 162
— herring fishery of, 150
— trade of, 152 *n.*, 160, 169
Beauvais, 105
Bec, monastery of, 49
Beccles, school at, 51
Becket, Thomas à, *v. sub* Canterbury, Archbishops of.
Beddgelert, 140
Bede, the Venerable, 37, 38, 57, 58
— — — works of, in Glastonbury library, 37, and *v. sub* St. Bede.
Beer, Assize of, 135
Begeham, Premonstratensian abbey at, 3
— Abbot of, 17
Bellardi, Luccan merchants' pardon to, 212
Belvoir Castle, muniment room at, 5
Benedict of Aniane, *v. sub* St. Benedict of Aniane.
Benedictines in England, 23, 24, 27, 31, 44, 49, 52, 55, 59, 60, 63, 64
Benuccio, Franceschino, son of, Florentine merchant, 194
Berengar of Tours, his controversy with Lanfranc, 38, 39
Bergnes, siege of, 86, 103
Berkeley, Sir Charles (later created Earl of Falmouth), in command of Duke of York's lifeguard, 72
Berkeley, Steward of the Hundred of, *v. sub* Smyth, J.
Berriew, fulling mill at, 158
Berwick-on-Tweed, 12
Beverley, St. John of, Life of, 55
Bianchi, Frescobaldi, 186 *n.*
Bibliography of British history, scheme for, ix–xxxiv.
Bileigh near Maldon, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3
Binham (in Norfolk), cell and school at, 45
Bishops, English, influence of, 42
Black Death, 138, 143, 288
Blackheath by Greenwich, 80
Blackstone, on the Exchequer, 203
Blague, Colonel of the King's Guards in Flanders, 69, 69 *n.*
— Sir Thomas, Lieutenant-Colonel, 85
Blanchland, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3
Blankets, export of Welsh, 159
Blickling Homilies, writer of the, 39
Blois, Peter of, historian, 188 *n.*
Boboni, Bobo di Giovanni, 195 *n.*
Bodenham, Sir Wingfield, 8
Bodleian Library, commemoration of the, ix.
Bohun, Humphrey de, 138 *n.*
Bologna, bankers of, 193
— Bishop of, 193
— Podestà of, 193
— University of, 52
Bonaccorsi, Reniero, Sienese merchant, 210
Bonaguidi, Loterio, Florentine merchant, 204
Bonaventano, Uguiccio, Italian banker, 190
Bondmen acquire right to trade, 253
— emancipation of, 243
— inventories of goods of, 253
— petition concerning, 259
— under the Tudors, 235–289
— Welsh, 138
Bonsignori, Sienese bankers, 212, 216
— — — collectors of Papal revenues in England, 211
— — — exchangers of Pope's chamber, 210
Books, British, found at St. Albans, 25
— English in Glastonbury library, 37
— given by Athelwold to Peterborough, 34
— scarcity of, in Middle Ages, 33

Boon-work not done by Tudor bondmen, 280
Booth, Sir George, 91, 100
Bordarii, 235
Boston Fair, Welshmen at, 131 *n.*
Bosworth, battle of, 248
Boulogne, 78, 80
Bourbourg, English regiments at, 83
Bouthall, Welsh cloths brought to, 159
Bowen, D., farmer of Roch and Pulle coal mines, 147 *n.*
Brabant, Duke of, Jean II., 178
— — — Godfrey, brother of, 178, 179
Bracton, on law of villeinage, 236, 243, 244, 245, 252, 257
Bradsole Abbey, 3; *vide* St. Radegund's Abbey.
Brakelond, Jocelin of, biographer of Abbot Samson of Bury, 56
Braose, de, charters to burgesses of Swansea by family of, 139, 140
Bravonius, Senatus, monk of Worcester and chronicler, style of, 59
Brecon, fulling mills at, 156
Bren, Llewellyn, rising of, 137 *n.*
'Bretland' Norse name for Wales, 125
Breuellio, Ralph de, seneschal of the Périgordais and Caorsin, 179 *n.*
Brice le Conté (near Brussels), 73
Bridge, Tobias, Major, 87 *n.*, 110
Bridgwater, 138
Bridlington Abbey, 49
Brihtnoth, Abbot of Ely, 29
Bristol, cloth trade of, 161 *n.*
— customs of, 160
— grain sent to Wales from, 167
— Irish trade with, 150
— Jewry in, 129 *n.*
— lead from, 146 *n.*
— market for Welsh cloth at, 159, 160
— mayor of, 262; and *v. sub* Cole.
— merchants of, 168, 169
— mint at, 134 *n.*
— port of, 146, 153 *n.*, 170
— weaving at, 156
— Welsh trade with, 124, 159, 160, 167, 169
— Earl of, *v. sub* Digby.
British tribes, withdrawal of, 121
Brittany, trade with Wales of, 160, 161, 167 *n.*
Britton, on villeinage, 244, 252
Brodholm (Nottinghamshire), convent of canonesses at, 4
Bromley Regis (Staffordshire), villein tenures at, 251
Brunetti, Gualterino, Italian banker, 190
Brussels, French garrison at St. Ghislain, near, 72
Brymbo (Denbigh), colliery at, 146
Brysunthie, villeins of, 252
Buckingham, Duke of, *v. sub* Stafford, Edward.
— Duchess of, *v. sub* Stafford, Alianore.
Bucks, Welsh cloth trade to, 159
Buiamonte, Giovanni, Florentine usurer, 217
Builth, limestone brought from Talgarth to, 144 *n.*
— merchants of, 130 *n.*
— portmen in the lordship of, 166
Buonaccorsi, Renucciccio, security given by Henry III. to, 191
Burgess *de vento et vico*, 166
Bury St. Edmunds, abbots of, Baldwin, 53
— — — — — Hermann, 36, 53, 59
— — — — — Samson, 36, 50, 51, 53, 56, 59
— — — monk of, Walter the doctor, 53
— — — St. Robert of, miracles of, 64
— — — school at, 50
'Bushy land,' 126
Butler, James, Duke of Ormond, colonel of Irish Royalist regiment in Flanders, 70, 70 *n.*, 71, 78, 85, 105
Butlers for Wales appointed, 168, 169 *n.*
By-laws of the Royal Historical Society revised, viii.
Byrhtferth, pupil of Abbo, 29
Byrtune, Ralph de, safe-conduct to, 146 *n.*

CAEN, Paul of, appointed Abbot of St. Albans, 44
Caerhun (Carnarvonshire), Roman mining at, 122 *n.*
Caerlleon-on-Usk (Caerleon), 123 *n.* 170 *n.*
— — — fulling mills at, 156 *n.*
— — — Roman mines at, 122 *n.*
Caermarthen, 123, 170
— castle of, 141
— English borough of, 162
— fulling mills at, 157
— letters of safe-conduct to men of, 139 *n.*
— merchants of, 169
— North, chensers in, 165
— Norwegian merchants in, 125
— petition of men of, 133 *n.*
— port of, 154 *n.*
— river fishery of, 150
— royal boats at, 141 *n.*
— wool staple at, 151, 152, 153
— struggle between burgess and prior and convent at, 164, 165
— trade of, 162
Caerphilly Castle, 134 *n.*
— fulling mills at, 156 *n.*
Caersws, mines at, 123 *n.*
Cahors, merchants of, *v. sub* Caorsins.
Calais, 79
— Premonstratensian monastery near, 3
— Staple of, 160
— Welsh wools shipped to, 153 *n.*, 154 *n.*
Cameros, fulling mill at, 157 *n.*
Canon law of usury, 209
Canonesses, English, 3
— Gilbertine, 3
Canons, Austin, 2
— Premonstratensian, 2
— regular, 2
— secular, 36
Canterbury, Archbishop of, Anselm, 'Cur Deus Homo' by, 47
— — — — friendly towards Jews, 64
— — — — influence of teaching of, 57, 60
— — — — Meditations of, 47
Canterbury, Archbishop of, Anselm, struggles of, with the king, 57, 60; and *v. sub* St. Anselm.
— — — Baldwin, 63
— — — Becket, Thomas à, 52, 56, 62, 63
— — — Cranmer, Thomas, 251
— — — Dunstan, 28, 36, 39, 41
— — — — books collected by, 37
— — — — disregards Papal dispensation, 41
— — — — education of, 26
— — — — his knowledge of Greek, 26, 34
— — — — made Abbot of Glastonbury, 27
— — — — revival of learning under, 23, 24, 35
— — — — revival of monasticism under, 29
— — — — as schoolmaster, 31
— — — — takes monastic vows, 26, 27
— — — — and *v. sub* St. Dunstan.
— — — Lanfranc, 23, 38, 43–45, 49, 55
— — — — Constitutions of, 44, 45
— — — — controversy with Berengar of Tours, 38, 39
— — — — influence of teaching of, 57
— — — — Life of, 56
— — — — rationalistic theories of, 53
— — — Odo, 24, 25
— — — — Life of, 55
— — — Ralph, 61
— — — Sigeric, 38
— Archbishops of, strife with York, 60, 61
— archbishopric of, Issues of the, 192
— Augustinian canons at, 51
— cathedral school at, 33, 36, 57
— fire at, destroyed library of, 58
— Gervase, monk of, 55
— Goscelin, a Norman monk transferred to, 55
— monks of, 56
— Precentor of, Osbern, 55

Cantilupe, Master William de, appointed King's Proctor at Rome, 190
Cantreds, the Four, 170
Caorsins, the, 185, 185 *n.*, 195, 196, 204 *n.*, 205, 209
— — denounced as usurers, 208
— — R. de Breuellis seneschal of, 179 *n.*
Capitulary of Theodulf of Orleans, 35
— of 817, 30, 31 *n.*
Caracena, Marquis of, Spanish Governor of the Netherlands, 68 *n.*, 100, 102
Cardiff, 162, 170
— fulling mills of, 156 *n.*
— gild of cordwainers at, 164
— gild of glovers at, 164
— Norwegian merchants in, 125
— port of, 141
— river fishery of, 150
— Solomon of, 129 *n.*
— wool staple at, 151
Cardigan, 141, 170 *n.*
— Abram, son of Bernard of, 129 *n.*
— castle, repair of, 129, 145 *n.*
— coal imported into, 146 *n.*
— English burgesses of, 162 *n.*
— fishery rights of, 150
— merchants of, 130 *n.*
— Norwegian merchants in, 125
— Welsh wool trade of, 157
Cardiganshire, chensers in, 165
— fulling mills in, 157
— lead mines in, 145 *n.*
— silver mines in, 148
Careles, Colonel, 99
Carnarvon, 123, 162, 170
— castle, repair of, 144 *n.*
— English borough of, 162
— port of, 151, 161
— river fishery of, 150
— royal boats at, 141 *n.*
— royal granary of, 140
— trade of, 146 *n.*, 160, 169
Carolingian revival, 26
— theologians, teaching of the, 37, 38
Carreghora (Denbigh), mill of, 144 *n.*
Carrickfergus, 78
Carter *v.* the Abbot of Malmesbury, case of, 289
Carthusian monasteries, rules for lending of books of, 48, 49
Cary, Henry, Viscount Falkland, 108
Cases under law of villeinage 19 Hen. IV. 263
— 21 Ed. IV., 263
— 19 Hen. VIII., 263
— 25 Hen. VIII., 263
Castell Gwallter, chensers at, 165 *n.*
Castell Math (near Nevin), fulling mill at, 158
Castle Combe (Wiltshire), rich villein family in manor of, 278
Castle Maud (Pain's Castle) in Elvael, *v. sub* Pain's Castle.
Castles, victualling of the Welsh, 167
Catalogus Angliæ, 8
Cathedrals, monastic, founded under the Norman kings, 44
Cave, Sir Thomas, monastic collections of, 4, 5
Cecil, Sir W., appointed commissioner to inquire into bondmen on Crown manors, 269
Ceiriog, woods of, cleared by Henry II., 139
Cella, John de, *v. sub* St. Albans, abbots of.
Census, collectors of, 206
Cerchi bianchi and neri, Florentine merchants, export of wool by the, 201 *n.*
Cesalini, Gualterio de, Roman merchant, 184 *n.*
Cevenkarnan, coal miners of, farm of the, 147 *n.*
Champagne, fairs of, 198, 214
Chancery, Court of, debts secured by recognisances in the, 204
— — — established by Canute, 31
Chancy, Joseph de, Treasurer, mandate to inquire about usurers, 212
Chartres, cathedral school at, 36
— Ivo of, Decretum of, 47
Cheddre, Robert de, farmed issues of the coket at Carmarthen, 153 *n.*

Chensers (censarii) in Wales, 165, 166
—, town, 166
Chepstow, 170, 170 *n.*
— millstones from, 144 *n.*
Cheshire, agricultural conditions of, 240
Chester, 170
— castle and manor of, 145 *n.*
— corn supplies from, 138
— merchants of, 148, 168, 169
— mint at, 134 *n.*
— port of, 146
— safe-conduct to men of, 146 *n.*
— Welsh trade with, 124, 141
'Chevage,' 238, 247, 248, 265–267
Cheyney, Prof., his theory of villeinage, 236
Chirbury, Crown forbids market at, 164
Chirk, fulling mill at, 158
Christchurch (Twinham), Augustinian canons at, 51
— monks of, 61
Chronicle, Anglo-Saxon, 55
— — — Continuations of the, 39, 55
— by Florence of Worcester, 56
— — Gervase of Canterbury, 56
Chronicler of Abingdon, 56
— — Ely, 56
— — Ramsey, 56
—, William of Newburgh, 57
Church, bondmen of the, 240
— councils, 49
— in England, 40, 41
— estates of the, 245
— laws of the, 40
— legacies to, 206
— relations with the State of, 59–62
— teaching in England of the, 38
— theory of autonomy of, 41
Church, Percy, 98
Churches, collegiate, 25, 36
Cilgerran (North Pembroke), fishery at, 150
— forest of, 140, 141
Cistercians in England, 24, 52, 62
— — — their relations with Jews, 64
— — — rules for lending books, 49
— — — teaching of, 62, 63
Cîteaux, Abbey of, its claim over English Benedictines, 9
Clare, Gilbert de, inquisition *post mortem*, 147 *n.*
— — — mines discovered by, 142
Clarges, Sir Thomas, 97
Clark, Samuel, Colonel, 77, 86, 86 *n.*, 90, 92
— — — regiment of, disbanded, 92
Clay Cotton in Northamptonshire, 250
Clement the Scot, 26
Clergy rebuked for not manumitting villeins, 239, 240
Clerks, secular, 30, 31
Cleves, duchy of, 1
Clifford, Master Richard de, 192
Close Roll, 138, 191
Cloth, English, imported into Wales, 155
— trade of Ireland, 169
— — — Wales, 155, 156, 159, 161, 163
— white, sent to Abbot of Prémontré, 20
— weaving in Wales, 139, 154
Clothi, Lewis Glyn, Welsh bard, 167
Cluniac movement on the Continent, 41
— priories, 44, 60
— rule, 30
Cluny, Abbey of, 60
— — — customs of, 44
— — — sends monks to St. Pancras, Lewes, 44
— — — school at, 30, 49
— — — Abbot of, Hugh, 44, 45
— — — — — Odo, 27, 30
Coalfields of South Wales, development of, 146, 147, 161
Coal, sea, 146, 147
Cobbeham, John de, 205 *n.*
Cochrane, Sir Bryce, Colonel, 77, 86, 86 *n.*, 90–92
— — — — cashiered, 92, 93
Cockersand, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3
Codes of Howel, 127
Coedtraeth, forest of, 140
— — — collieries in, 146, 146 *n.*, 147 *n.*
— — — fulling mills in, 157 *n.*

Coke on villeinage, 243, 244, 252
Coldstream Guards, 110
Cole, R., Mayor of Bristol, 261–263, 277
— — — — — Thomas, brother of, 261, 262
Cole *v.* Stafford, case of, 262, 277
Coleman, monk of Worcester, author of Anglo-Saxon life of St. Wulfstan, 56
Colern, Wilts, manor of, belonging to New College, Oxford, 277
'Colloquium ad Pueros,' by Ælfric, 32, 33
Colonna, Peter, Cardinal, appointed as judge by Pope Clement V., 16
Columbariis, Matthew de, 192
Commission to inquire into manumission of villeins, 269
Common Bench, debts secured by recognisance in Court of, 204
Commons, House of, 97, 101
— — — petition concerning villeins to, 259
— — — summon Italian bankers, 202
'Concordia Regularis,' 32
Condé garrisoned by Irish regiments in service of France, 71
— Louis II. of Bourbon, Prince of, 75, 83 *n.*
— — — — — — — advances to raise siege of Mardyke, 85
— — — — — — — taken prisoner by Spaniards, 71
Conon, Abbey of, 2
Conradin IV. *v. sub* Germany, king of.
Contadino, Sienese merchant, 203 *n.*
Conway, river, 141, 170, 170 *n.*
— — fishery of the, 150
Copyhold tenure, history of, 288
Corbeil, Benedictine abbey at, 27
Cordwainers, gild of, at Cardiff, 164
Corn, production of, in Wales, 137
— scarcity of, 138
Corndon forest (Montgomery), quarries of, 144
Cornely, lord of, grants mining rights to monks of Margam, 142
Cornwall, Crown manors in, 269
Cotarii, 235
Cotton trade, Manchester, 169
Coulon, Colonel, 77 *n.*
Council, General, at Vienne, 15, 16
— — Lateran, 51
— — forbids monks to practise medicine, 54
— — issues decrees hostile to Jews, 64
— of State, 94, 95
Court Leet, 'Manner of keeping,' by Jonas Adames, 243
Court Leets, 249 *n.*
'Court of poor men's causes,' 289
Court rolls, 157 *n.*, 247, 250 *n.*
Courts, separation of spiritual and temporal, 49
Coventry, Bishop of, Alexander de Stavenby, 190
— trade with Wales of, 168 *n.*
Coverham, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3
Craft gilds in Wales, 164
Cragh, Madoc, timber carrier, 140
Crane, Agnes, villein of manor of Ormsby, 267
— John, villein of manor of Ormsby, 267
— Thomas, villein of manor of Ormsby, 267
Crécy, Adam de, 10–13, 16, 17, 20
Crespin, Master W., sent as King's Proctor to Rome, 190
Cressingham Court Rolls, 250 *n.*
Creyke, in Northamptonshire, manor of, 250
Criccieth, lead imported from Bristol to, 146 *n.*
Crickhowell, townsmen of, 161 *n.*
— Roman remains at, 122 *n.*
Crispin, Gilbert, Abbot of Westminster, friendly towards the Jews, 64, 64 *n.*
— Milo, monk of Westminster, 56
Cristofori, Andrea, Sienese merchant, 215 *n.*

Cristofori, Mino, Sienese merchant, 215 *n.*
— Pietro, Sienese merchant, 215 *n.*
Crockards, license to purchase, 199
Cromwell, Henry, 82
— Oliver, Lord Protector, 68, 76, 82, 86, 87, 99, 109
— — — — foreign policy of, 67
– Richard, 88, 89
— Thomas, letter *re* manumission of villeins, 277
Cromwellian army in Flanders, 68–119
— — garrisoned at Dunkirk, 97, 106–110
Crouch, defendant in suit of villeinage, 258
Crown, the, favours the Jews, 64
— mining rights of the, 145 *n.*
— revenues of the, 183
Croxton, 13
— Abbot of, 14
— Premonstratensian monastery at, 3
— — — — Domesday of, 5
Croyland, Abbey of, accounts of, 249 *n*
Crusades, influence of, 54
Curia (Roman), English Premonstratensian, appeal to, 13–15
— financial transactions of, 178
Customs farmed by Italians, 202, 203
— the Great, 200, 201
— the New, 200, 200 *n.*
— the Old, 200 *n.*
— of Bristol, 160
— — Carmarthen, 153 *n.*
— on wool &c., 151, 153, 154 *n.* 182, 183
— taken at Welsh ports, 151, 168
Cwmsymlog (Cardiganshire), silver mine at, 148
Cwmtauddwr, mining rights of, 142 *n.*
— fulling mill at, 158
Cynwil, chensers at, 165 *n.*
Cyveiliog (Machynlleth), clothiers from, 159

Dairy keeping in Wales, 139
Dale, or Stanley Park, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3
Danes, colony in Wales of, 125
— invasions of, 23, 25, 36, 42, 43, 124, 125
— king of the, Canute, 31
Dante records loan to Prince Henry, 187, 187 *n.*, 216
Danzig, Scottish merchants at, Charles II. tries to raise loan from, 70
Darcy, Sir James, in command of Irish regiment at Condé, later joins Charles II. in Flanders, 71
Dartmoor Court Rolls, 251, 252
Ddu, Cadoan, 134 *n.*
Dean, Forest of, 143 *n.*
— — — iron from, 148 *n.*
— — — millstones from, 144
Debt, distraint of Englishmen in Wale for, 171
— law of, touching villeins, 253
Decangi (Cangi) tribe, in Flintshire 122 *n.*
Decretum of Ivo of Chartres, 47
— — Gratian, 47
Dee, river, fulling mills on the, 157 *n.*
Deffren Ebor, fulling mills at, 156 *n.*
'De Fide Ecclesiæ contra Judeos,' by Gilbert Crispin, 64 *n.*
'*De libertate probanda*,' suit of, 258, 259
'De Literis Græcorum,' given by Athelwold to Peterborough, 34
'De manumissione servorum,' bill rejected by Lords, 28 Henry VIII., 243
Demons, remedy against, 41
'*De nativo habendo*,' suit of, 258
Denbigh, colliery in, 146
— fulling mills in, 157 *n.*
Derby Household Books, 250
'Desiderata Curiosa,' by Francis Peck, 4
Despenser, Hugh le, the younger lord of Glamorgan, 143 *n.*
'De Veneficiis,' 40 *n.*
Devon, Crown manors in, 269
— rebels, 251
— sheriff of, order to, 143
Diceto, Ralph de, historian, 57
Dietrich, commentator on Ælfric, 34

Digby, George, Earl of Bristol, 72, 97
— — — — — regiment of, 85, 100 *n.*, 105
— — — — — rout of, 86
'Digestum vetus,' 47
Dinevaior, Lord Rhys of, rebuilt Cardigan Castle, 129
Disney, Colonel, 78 *n.*
Diss in Norfolk, Abbot Samson educated at, 50
Divination, prevalence of the practice of, 40
Doctors in English monasteries, 53
Dodford, cell of, 3
Dodington, in manor of Long Bennington, 273, 274
'Doleth' (Denbigh), fulling mill at, 157 *n.*
Dolpenmaen, royal forge at, 147 *n.*
Dolvorwyn forest in Montgomery, 140
Domesday Survey, 30, 149, 235
Donato, Contero, son of, merchant of Florence, 194
Donatus, text-book used in monastic schools, 31, 33, 37
Doni, Federigo, Sienese merchant, 215 *n.*
Dorchester, Bishop of, Etheric, monk of Ramsey, 36
Dorset, Alexander de, Keeper of the Mint, 191
Dosy, villein family in manor of Forncett, 277
Dover, 79, 80
Dovey, valley of the river, wools from the, 159
Drussellan (S. Wales), Castle of, 144 *n.*
Dublin, exchange of, 199
— Jews in, 129 *n.*
— merchants of, 138
— mint of, 199
— murage custumals of, 144, 161
— trade of, 138, 167
Dugdale's 'Monasticon Anglicanum,' 4
Dunes, battle of the, 85, 86, 97, 110
Dungan, Michael, Captain, 110
Dunkirk, 67, 76, 84, 87–90, 93, 94, 96, 101, 102, 104, 108
— annexation, 9, 97
Dunkirk, fall of, 86
— sale of, 67, 102, 104, 105, 107, 109, 110
— siege of, 82, 84, 86
Dunstable, school attached to house of Augustinian canons, 51, 52
— — Geoffrey of Maine, master of, 50
Dunstan, *v. sub* Canterbury, Archbishops of, and St. Dunstan.
Dureford, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3
Durham, cathedral library of, 47, 47 *n.*
— prior and convent of, 180
Dycus, Tenan ap Tudor ap, farms North Wales slate quarries, 144

EADMER, the Englishman, precentor of Canterbury, author of 'Lives of St. Dunstan' and other saints, 55; and *v. sub* St. Albans, Abbot of.
East Anglia, monasteries, of affiliated to Abingdon, 29
Ecclesham (Denbigh), vill of, fulling mills in the, 157 *n.*
Edeyrnion (Denbigh), 124 *n.*
Education, King Alfred's efforts to promote, 24, 25
Eggleston, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3
Eginlle (Powysland), rhingildry of, fulling mill at, 157
Egrin, river, used for transport of quarry stone, 141
Ehrenberg, Dr. Richard, 210
Elfeah the Bald, Bishop of Winchester, 26, 27
'Elucidarium sive Dialogus de Summa totius Christianæ Theologiæ,' by Lanfranc, 53
Elvael, drapers of, 159
— merchants of, 130 *n.*
— Pain's Castle in, 157 *n.*
Ely, Abbot of, Brihtnoth, 29
— — — Leofsin, 42
— Bishop of, John, 206 *n.*
— — — John Morton, 277, 278
— — — Richard Redman, 7; and *v. sub* Exeter, Bishop of.
— chronicler Thomas, 56

Ely House, Holborn, 7
— monk of, Goscelin, author of 'Life of St. Ethelreda,' 55
— monks of, 29
— Prior of, impounds goods of a villein, 276 *n.*
— river, fisheries of the, 149
Emancipation of bondmen demanded by Norfolk rebels in 1549, 243
Emperor Charles the Great, 31
— — — — capitularies of, 32
— — — — revival of learning under, 35
— Frederick II., Italian campaign of, 184 *n.*
— Henry IV., 1
— Louis the Pious, 30
— — — — capitulary of, 32
— Otto I. (the Great), 31, 34
— Otto IV., 196 *n.*
England, 39
— bondmen in, 239
— Commonwealth of, by Sir Thomas Smith, 239
— Hildebrandine opinions not accepted in, 59
— kings of: Æthelred, 31, 42
— — — Alfred, 23, 25
— — — — revival of learning under, 24
— — — Athelstan, 25, 26, 34 *n.*
— — — Canute, 41
— — — — laws of, 42
— — — — restores monasteries, 43
— — — — revival of learning under, 36
— — — — royal chancery established by, 31
— — — Charles II., 68, 74, 75, 78 *n.*, 95, 96, 101–3, 106, 109, 110
— — — — — expelled from France, 67
— — — — — foot guards, 9, 10
— — — — — raises army in Flanders, 68–72
— — — — — sells Dunkirk, 67
— — — Edgar, 23, 25 *n.*, 31, 36, 41
— — — — canons of, 42
— — — — clerks of, 31
England, kings of: Edgar, laws of, 42
— — — — revival of monasticism under, 29
— — — Edmund, 27
— — — Edred, 27
— — — Edward the Confessor, 36, 43
— — — — — — canonisation of, 64; and *v. sub* St. Edward.
— — — Edward the Elder, 25
— — — Edward I., 128, 151, 178, 179 *n.*, 183 *n.*, 189 *n.*, 200, 205, 211, 213, 215 *n.*, 217
— — — — — administration of Wales under, 132, 133, 139, 145, 150
— — — — — conquest of Wales by, 132, 184 *n.*
— — — — — debts of, 182, 185, 186 *n.*, 186, 199
— — — — — marriage with Margaret of France, 179
— — — — — municipal policy of, 166
— — — — — Patent Rolls of, 185 *n.*
— — — — — villeinage under, 268
— — — Edward II., 12, 13, 151, 156, 164, 177, 200, 217
— — — — — his debts to Italian bankers, 202
— — — Edward III., 160, 217
— — — — — fixes wool staples for Wales, 151
— — — — — Statute of Labourers by, 250
— — — Edward IV., 142 *n.*, 150, 250
— — — — — institutes, Court of the Marches, 172
— — — — — year books of, 243
— — — Edward VI., Crown surveyors of, 267
— — — Henry I., 51, 52, 57
— — — Henry II., 54, 57, 185
— — — — — his quarrel with Becket, 62, 63
— — — Henry III., 139, 180, 196, 197 *n.*, 207, 210, 211

England, kings of: Henry III. accepts crown of Sicily for his son Edmund, 179
— — — — — conquest of Wales by, 132
— — — — — dealings with Italian merchants, 181, 185, 191, 193, 195, 197 *n.*, 208, 209
— — — — — Edmund, son of, 179
— — — — — letter to Podestà of Bologna from, 193
— — — — — relations with Papacy, 215
— — — Henry IV., 162
— — — Henry VI., 154, 163, 262, 263
— — — Henry VII., 247, 254, 289
— — — — year books of, 243
— — — Henry VIII., 146, 157, 243, 245, 248, 265, 277
— — — — year books of, 243
— — — James I., 247
— — — James II., 106; and *v. sub* York, Duke of.
— — — John, loans of, 185, 189, 194
— — — Richard I., loans raised by, 193
— — — Richard II., 145 *n.*, 259
— — — — grants charter to Hereford, 171
— — — Stephen, 62, 63
— — — William I., 24, 43, 49, 53, 60
— — — William II., 44, 57, 60
— — — William III., 106 *n.*
— monastic schools in, 65
— Princes of, Edmund, son of Henry III., 179, 211
— — — Edward, Black Prince, 153
— — — Henry, son of Henry II., 187
— Queens of: Eleanor of Provence, 211, 215 *n.*
— — — Elizabeth, 236, 245, 247, 248, 252, 261, 263, 264, 267, 268, 270, 271, 279
— — — Isabella of Angoulesme, 204 *n.*
— — — Mary, 95
England, revival of learning in, 25 31, 35, 38, 39, 43, 45
— Roman law of bondage in, 239
— royal revenue in, 180, 181
— spread of monasticism in, 62
— study of Roman law in, 47
Englefield, miners of, 145, 145 *n.*
English Church, ecclesiastical independence of the, 41
— garrisons in Wales, 138
— Hay (Radnorshire), fulling mill at, 157 *n.*
— merchants in Wales, 129
— saints, Normans' contempt for, 53
— towns in Wales, 129, 130
— writers, Latin style of, 39, 40
Epidemics of fourteenth century destroyed serfdom, 235
Eskeivok (Anglesey), colliery at, 146
Estaniaco, William de, archdeacon of Lincoln, 192
Estherdam, Norfolk, manor of, manumission of villeins in, 279
Ethelgar, Abbot of New Minster, 29
Ethelweard, the ealdorman, chronicle of, 39
Ethelwold, obscure style of, 40
Etheric, monk of Ramsey, Bishop of Dorchester, 36
Eucharist, Ælfric's view of, 38
Evesham, Abbot of, Elfweard (later Bishop of London), 36
— monastic library of, 48
— — school of, 32
— — — — Wulfstan educated in, 43
Ewglysegle (Denbigh), iron forges at, 147 *n.*
Ewloe (Flintshire), colliery at, 146
— lead mines at, 145 *n.*
Exchequer, Court of, payment into the, 202
— — — recognisances of stranger merchants enrolled at, 204
Exeter, Bishop of, Leofric, 37
— — — Redman, 7, 19, 20, 21
— — — — Life of, 6, 7
— — — — nominated Vicar of Premonstratensians in England, 7

Exeter, Bishop of, Redman, register of, 4–7
— — — — visitations of, 6 and *v. sub* Ely, Bishop of, and St. Asaph, Bishop of
— Exchange of, 199
Eynsham, Abbot of, Ælfric, 24, 26, 32–35, 37–40, 42
— Council of, 40 *n.*, 42
— monastic library of, 48

FAIR of St. Bartholomew in London, 159
Fairborne, Sir Palmes, 109
Fairs, 129–131, 166
— English, 131, 134
— Welsh, 164
Falaise, 194
Falmer, manor of, bondmen on the, 242
Falmouth, Earl of, *v. sub* Berkeley, 72
Fanshawe, Sir Richard, English ambassador to Portugal, 109, 110
Faricius, Abbot of Abingdon, 58
Farrell, colonel of Irish regiment in service of Charles II. deserted from French, 72, 99, 100 *n.*, 103, 105
'Favour of liberty,' 256–258, 260, 261
Fenwicke, lieutenant-colonel of Lockhart's regiment, 85
Fer, Bernard Pee de, wine gauger for all Wales, 168, 169 *n.*
Feudal age, 235
— ideas, spread of, in Wales, 155
Ffrenssh, Reginald le, farmer of the issues of the coket at Carmarthen, 153 *n.*
Fiennes, George, Major, 108
Fifteenths, 183
— levied by Henry III., 191
Fisheries in Wales, 149, 150, 163
Fishing-nets used in Wales, 149
Fitzgerald, Colonel John, lieutenant-governor of Tangiers, 105
Fitzherbert, 'Modus tenendi curiam baronis,' by, 242, 258, 259, 267
— 'Surveyinge,' by, 240
— Sir Anthony, 240
— John, 240
Fitz-Peter, Geoffrey, Treasurer of England, 194
Flanders, 70, 86, 93, 99, 100, 101, 110
— Royalist and Cromwellian armies in, 68–119
— Welsh trade with, 152, 160
Fleetwood, William, Lieutenant-Colonel, 108 *n.*
Flemings displaced in wool trade by Italians, 216
Flemish artisans in Wales, 134 *n.*, 155, 156
— cloth brought into Wales, 161
— merchants in Wales, 129
Fleta, 252
Fleury, Abbey of, 27, 30, 31
— — — reform of, 27, 30
— — — schools of, 30
Flint, burgesses of, lead-mining privileges to, 145
— castle and manor of, 145 *n.*
Flintshire, collieries in, 146
— lead mines in, 144, 145, 146 *n.*
— silver mines in, 148
— wools of, 152 *n.*, 157 *n.*
Florence, cloth-weaving at, 208
— merchants of, 176, 178, 194, 197 *n.*, 204, 206, 208 *n.*
— — — relations with Pope of, 215
Florence, monk of Worcester, chronicle by, 56
Folcard, Abbot of Thorney, *v. sub* Thorney, Abbots of.
Forest of Dean, *v. sub* Dean, forest of.
Forests of Wales, clearing of the, 136, 137, 139
— — — game preserved in the, 148
— — — issues of the, 141
— — — profits of the, 148
Forncett, manor of, 238, 266 *n.*, 277 *n.*
Fortescue, Sir John, on the governance of England, 240, 256
— — — on villeinage, 244, 256
Fort Lyon, 103
Fort Royal, 87
Foston, in manor of Long Bennington, 273
Fountains, Abbot of, Henry Murdac, appointed Archbishop of York, 62
France, Charles II. expelled from, 67
— — — sells Dunkirk to, 67

France, Cromwell's treaty with, 67
— heresy in, 54
— king of, Philip le Bel, 178, 179, 216, 217
— mediæval, compared with England, 182
— monastic schools in, 30, 31
— trade with Wales of, 148, 160, 167, 169
— villeinage in, 239, 287
— at war with England, 182
— at war with Spain, 67, 68, 75, 85, 100, 101
Franzesi, Albizzo, 178
'Fratres Saccorum,' Church of, at Lincoln, 11, 13
Free boroughs in Wales, 104
Frescobaldi, Filippo, and Giovanni de, Florentine bankers, 177, 178, 186 *n.*, 192, 197 *n.*, 198, 199, 202, 216
'Frisemen' of Wales, 159
Frithegode, 24, 25
Fulling mills in Lancashire, 156
— — in Wales, 154–156, 158
Furne, Spanish regiment attacks, 103

GALTERI, Baroncino, silk merchant of Lucca, 211
— — — — — — accompanies Edward I. to Wales, 184 *n.*
Gant, Gilbert de, son of founder of Bridlington, 49
Gascony, merchants of, 192
— Welsh trade of, 160, 167
Gauger of wines for Wales appointed, 168, 168 *n.*
Gedney, in Leicestershire, manor of, 249 *n.*
Geneur, Glyn, commote of, near Aberystwyth, 145
Gennep, Count of, 1
Genoa, charge for transmission of money to, 189 *n.*
Gentili, Gentile, Italian banker, 190
Geraldines, Irish family, origin of, 177 *n.*
Gerard, Lord, 73
Gerardo, merchant of Piacenza, 196 *n.*
German miners in Wales, 123
Germanus, Prior of Ramsey, 20
Germany, heresy in, 54
— revival of learning, 38
— villeinage in, 287, 288
Gervase, monk of Canterbury, chronicler, 55, 56
Gettywood, in Flintshire, granted to Basingwerk Monastery, 137
Ghent, Benedictine abbey at, 27, 31
Gherardini, Otto degli, Florentine banker, 177 *n.*
Ghibellines expelled from Siena, 215 *n.*, 216 *n.*
Gibbon, Colonel, regiment of, 84, 87 *n.*, 88, 92
Gifford, Dr. Andrew, sub-librarian of the British Museum, 4, 5
Gilbert, Robert, villein on manor of Long Benington, 273, 274
— Thomas, villein on manor of Long Benington, 273, 274
— of Sempringham charged with sending money to Becket, 63; and *v. sub* St. Gilbert.
Gilbertine canons, 3, 49
— — aid Becket's escape, 62, 63
— — forbidden to hold secular schools, 52
— — houses of, 24
Gildas proved reliable authority by William of Newburgh, 57, 58
— style of, 59
Gilds, *v. sub* Craft, and Merchant.
Giordani, Lionardo, Italian banker, 190
Giovanelli, Reginaldo, Sienese banker, 196 *n.*
Giraldus Cambrensis, 123 *n.*, 128, 148, 149, 156, 187
Giurda, Pietro, Roman merchant, 184 *n.*
Glamorgan, 138, 170
— fulling mills in, 156 *n.*
— mines in, 142, 143 *n.*, 148
Glastonbury Abbey, 44, 236
— — Abbot of, Dunstan, 27, and *v. sub* Canterbury, Archbishop of.
— — library at, 37, 47, 58
— John of, 31, 37

Glastonbury Abbey, monks of, 26
— — revival of learning at, 31
— — school of, 26, 27
— — survey of estates of, 246, 264
— — tomb of St. Patrick the younger at, 26
Glendower, Owen, 7 ; *v. sub* Glyndwr.
Glossaries, Anglo-Saxon and Latin, 33
Gloucester, Henry, Duke of, younger brother of Charles II., 71, 83 *n.*, 92, 100
— — — — regiment of, 73, 85, 99, 103, 104
Gloucestershire, Crown manors in, 269
Gloucestria, William de, 197 *n.*
Glovers, gild of, at Cardiff, 164
Glyncothy, forest of, fulling mill in the, 158
Glyndwr, Owen, rebellion of, 137, 153, 158, 162
Glynhoddna, forest of (Monmouthshire), colliery at, 147
Glyntaf, forest of (Monmouthshire), colliery at, 147
Glynvychan near Llangollen, fulling mill at, 158
Godfrey of Malmesbury, 44
Gogh, Llewelyn, clothier, 159 *n.*
Goldcliff, prior and convent of, 143
Gorham, Simon de, *v. sub* St. Albans, Abbots of.
Goscelin, a Norman monk, author of 'Lives of Saints,' 55
Gottschalk regarded as heretical by Ælfric, 38
Gower, 170
— fulling mills at, 156
Gower, John, 'Mirour de l'omme,' by, 176
Gowerland, forests of, 139, 140
Grace, Richard, Colonel of Ormond's regiment in Flanders, 70, 73, 85, 86, 99, 100 *n.*, 105, 106
Grafton, in Northamptonshire, manor of, 250
Grandison, Othode, knight, Edward I.'s envoy to Rome, 189 *n.*
Gratian, decretum of, 47
Gravesend, 92
Gray's Inn, lectures by Bacon at, 243
Greatanlea, Council of, 40 *n.*
Greek, Dunstan's knowledge of, 26, 34
— taught by Irish scholars, 26
— — in palace school of Otto the Great, 34
Greek words frequently used by Æthelwold, 40
Gregorio, Restauro, Sienese merchant, 208 *n.*
Grenadier guards, origin of the regiment, 69 *n.*, 103, 110
Grenlawe, Master W. de, appointed King's Proctor to Rome, 190
Greyne, Edward, Abbot of, 6
Griffith, Rees ap, Kt., keeper of the coast of South Wales against pirates, 171 *n.*
Grimbaldi, Peter, 190
Grindstones exported from Wales to Ireland, 144
Gros, John le, debts of, 205
Grufudd, Llewelyn ap, 131 *n.*, 132
Gualteri, Baroncino, Luccan banker, 178
Guardabene, Lamberto, Italian banker, 190
Guelfs, defeat at Montapenti of the, 214
Guggio, Bestorio di Guidi di, Sienese banker, 190
Guglielmi, Diotaiuto, of Florence, banker to Queen Eleanor, 204 *n.*, 211
Guglielmi, Figlino, Italian banker, 191, 192, 215 *n.*
Guibertini, Pietro, Bolognese banker, lends money to Richard I., 193
Guidi, Diotaviva, Sienese banker, 210
Guidiccioni, Riccardo, financier, 182 *n.*, 206 *n.*
Guidotto, merchant of Piacenza, 196 *n.*
Guisborough, prior and convent of, 180
Guisnes, English regiments at, 83
Gwent, 170
— fulling mills at, 156

Gwynne, John, Captain of King's Guard, 98, 99 *n.*
Gyningham manor, suit concerning villeins of, 264 *n.*, 265 *n.*

HADHAM, Philip de, 188 *n.*
Hadnock, Roman mines at, 122 *n.*
Hagneby, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3
Hainault, Middleton's Scottish regiment at, 73
Hale, T., villein, free manumission of, 269, 270
Hales Owen, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3, 8
— — — — — Edward Greyne, Abbot of, 6
Hamburg (Hambourgh), Scots in Swedish service at, 73
Hamilton, Sir James, lieutenant-colonel of the King's Guards, 69, 70, 73
Harleck, Castle of, 141
Harley, Sir Edward, Governor of Dunkirk, 96, 97, 103, 106, 107
Harley, Robert, Colonel, regiment of horse of, 96, 104 *n.*, 106, 107, 108 *n.*, 109, 110
Harrison, John, author of the 'Description of England,' 239
— — views on villeinage, 245, 287
Hartlepool, customs collected at, 200, 200 *n.*
Hatfield, tithes of, assigned for procuring books, 45
Hatsel, Captain, 79
Haundescote, Peter de, Flemish merchant, 166 *n.*
Hautecombe, Savoy, abbey of, 188 *n.*
Haverfordwest, 170, 170 *n.*
— fulling mills at, 157 *n.*
— industrial centre of mediæval Wales, 162
— merchants of, 169
— origin of the name, 125
— port of, 154 n.
— river fishery of, 150
— trade of, 138, 151
Hay, forest of, 140
Heath's Chronicle, 76
Hengoed, fulling mill at, 157 *n.*
Heppa or Shap, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3
Hereford, 129, 132 *n.*, 170, 172
— Bishop of, Peter de Aigueblanche, 179, 180, 185 *n.*, 207
— — Swinfield, 156
— charter to, 171, 172
— citizens of, 140
— Jewry in, 129 *n.*
— market for Welsh cloth at, 159
— mint at, 134 *n.*
— trade of, 130
Herenno, Enrico, Sienese banker, partner of Bonsignori, 210
Heresy, Ælfric's dread of, 38
— not rife in England, 38, 54
Hermann of Binham, master of the school at Binham, 50
— of Bury, *v. sub* Bury St. Edmund's.
Herring fisheries on Welsh coast, 150
Hertwell in Northamptonshire, manor of, 250
Heynes family, wool manufacturers: villeins regardant to manor of Combe Castle, Wilts, 278
Hide, Abbot of, 270
Hides, customs on, 153
— 'New Custom' on, 182, 183
High Easter, Essex, customs of manor of, 270
Hildebrand, *v. sub* Pope Gregory VII.
Hildebrandine conception of Papacy, 59, 60, 63
'Historia Britonum,' by Geoffrey of Monmouth, rejected by William of Newburgh, 58
History, study of, during the Norman period, 54, 65
Hokes, John, lead mines farmed by, 145 *n.*
Holbeche, in Cambridge, manor of, 249 *n.*
Holles, Gervase, 8
Holyhead, 170 *n.*
Holy Land, Bonsignori, collectors of aids for, 206, 211

Holy Land, Edward I. returns from the, 185 *n.*
Holywell, lead mines at, 145 *n.*
Hondsdroote, Spaniards approach, 103
Honey imported into Wales, 148
Hope (Denbigh), fulling mill at, 157 *n.*
Hopedale (Flintshire), colliery at, 146, 146 *n.*
Horneby, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3
Hoveden, Roger, historian, 57
Howell the Good, Code of, 126
Hugh, Abbot of Cluny, 44, 45
Hugh, the Chanter of York, chronicler, 60
Hughes, Lieut.-Colonel, 86
Huls, Hugo, farms North Wales slate quarries, 144
Hunston, T., claimed as villein regardant to manor of St. Gyles Tydde, 278
Huntingdon, Augustinian canons at, 51
— Henry of, historian, 57
Hyde, Edward, Earl of Clarendon, 69 *n.*, 71, 95, 98

Idmiston, Wilts, manor of, 277, 278
Imola, Benvenuto da, 187
Inchiquin, Lord, 109
Inclosures of fifteenth century, 236
Inglesco, Bonaccorso, son of, Florentine merchant, 194
Inguar, the Dane, described by Abbo, 28
'Institutiones Justiniani cum autenticis et infortiato,' 47
Inventories of bondsmen's goods, 247, 253
Investiture struggle, monastic writers indifferent to, 60
Ireland, Welsh trade with, 124, 125, 141, 144, 150, 160, 167
Irford, in Lincolnshire, convent of canonesses at, 4
Irishmen in French service, 72
Irish regiment raised by Charles II. in Flanders, 68, 70, 70 *n.*, 74, 103
Irish scholars, 26
Irish scholars, poverty of, 26
— — their knowledge of Greek, 34
Irish Sea, pirates in the, 170, 171
Iron manufactured in England, 148
— mines in Wales, 143, 143 *n.*, 147, 148
— Spanish, 148
— trade, 169
Isacke of London, 275
'Issue Memoranda Rolls,' 191, 197 *n.*
Italian merchants, 182, 185, 203, 215
— — collect the customs, 200, 202
— — collect Papal revenues, 206, 207
— — control French revenues, 179 *n.*
— — influence in England of, 175, 177, 208
— — pardons to, 212
— — taxation of, 210
— — wool trade of 216
Italy, heresy in, 54
— trade of, 175
Ithel Ammel, Blethin ap, freeholder at Brymbo, 146 *n.*

Jacopo, Rinaldo di, Sienese merchant, 207
Jacopo, Tolomeo di, Sienese merchant, 207
James, Duke of York, commands regiment in Flanders, 70, 71 74, 75, 100; and *v. sub* England, Kings of: James II.
Janiani, James, of the Frescobaldi, export of wool by the, 201 *n.*
Jarrow, Benedictine abbey at, 27
Jews, 209
— books against the, 64
— hatred of the, 64
— in Ireland, 129 *n.*
— in Wales, 129 *n.*
— massacre of the, 64
— their methods of money lending, 213
John of Glastonbury, *v. sub* Glastonbury.
Jones, Edward, marriage fines paid by, 278
Jornalia Rolls, 181 *n.*, 183 *n.*

Jumièges, Godfrey of, appointed Abbot of Malmesbury, 44

KEBLE, on villein law, 254
Kedewain (Powysland), fulling mill at, 157 *n.*
Kenvanvas (Denbigh), fulling mill at, 157 *n.*
Ket demands emancipation of villeins, 268
Kidwelly, lordship of, coal mines in the, 147 *n.*
Kilvey, in Gower, forest of, colliery in the, 147
King's Guards, the regiment of the, 69, 69 *n.*, 86, 99, 101, 103
Kingsland (Hereford), quarries of, 144
Kingston Lacy (Dorset), inventory of R. Mackerell of, 253 *n.*
— — — manumission of villeins of manor of, 280
Kingston-upon-Hull, Exchange of, 199
Kingwell, Maurice, Lieutenant-Colonel, 108
Kitchin, handbook of procedure in manorial courts by, 243
Knightley, Major, 107
Knighton, clothiers of, 159
— fulling mill at, 157 *n.* 158
Knights Templars, 15
Kyrkefee, in Lincolnshire, Abbey of, 249 *n*,
Kyrkton, William de, canon of Barlings, general proctor in England of Premonstratensians, 13, 14, 17

LABOUR, immobility of, 143
— manual, not enforced by English Benedictines, 45
Labourers, scarcity of, in mediæval Wales, 143
'La James of Carnarvon,' ship plundered by pirates, 170 *n.*
Lambertino, Italian banker, 190
Lampadern, 170 *n.*
Lampeter, fulling mills near, 157
Lancashire, agricultural conditions of, 240
Lancashire, fulling mills in, 156
Lancaster, Duchy of, 264
— — — manumissions of villeins in the, 248, 269, 271
— — — special commissions of the, 267, 279
Lancaster, Earl of, Edmund, son of Henry III.. 179
Landymore (West Gower), fulling mill of, 156 *n.*
Lanfranc, *v. sub* Canterbury, Archbishops of
Langdon, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3
— — — — — Abbot of, 10–13, 15, 16
Langedon, Richard de, 197 *n.*
Langley, John, merchant of Bristol, licence to ship wools, 153 *n.*, 154 *n.*
Langley, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3
Lanienyth (Cardiganshire), fulling mills at, 157
Lantfred, pupil of Athelwold, 31
Lanzo, Prior of St. Pancras, Lewes, 44
Laon, bishop of, 2
Latin literary language after Norman Conquest, 59
Latin taught in monastic schools, 33
Laurentii, Vermulgio, *v. sub* Lorenzi, Vermeio.
Lavendon, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3
Laverdans, Edward I. at, 189 *n.*
Law, English ecclesiastical, 42
— study of Roman, in England, 47
Lawhaden, fulling mill at, 156 *n.*
Lead imported from Isle of Man, 146 *n.*
— mines of Devon, 143 *n.*
— — — Flintshire, 144, 145
Leadam, I. S., article on Last Days of Bondage in England by, 236, 246, 263, 288
Learning, revival of, in England, 25, 31, 35, 38, 39, 43, 45
— — — — Germany, 38
Lee, H., Sir, grant for manumission of villeins to, 271–275
Lee, Roland, President of Court of Marches, 172

Legge, Nicholas, farmer of issues of coket at Carmarthen, 153 *n.*
Leicester, Welsh cloth trade to, 159
Leominster, manumission of bondmen at, 279
— trade of, 130
Levens, birthplace of Bishop Redman, 6
Lewes, Abbey of St. Pancras at, founded from Cluny, 44
Leyston, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3
'Libell of English Policye,' 168
'[Liber] qui vocatur Bartholomeus contra Judeos,' 64 *n.*
Liberate Rolls, 186 *n.*, 196
— writ of, 190–192
Libraries, monastic, 37, 45, 49, 57
Licques near Calais, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3
Life Guards, origin of the regiment of, 110
Lillingston, Henry, Colonel of Royalist regiment in Flanders, 77, 85, 86, 88–91, 94, 95, 106–108, 110
— — — Luke, son of, 78 *n.*
Lincoln, Aaron of, 64
— Archdeacon of, William de Estaniaco, 192
— Bishop of, Robert Grosseteste, 213
— diocese of, assessment on the, 180
— fair, Welshmen at, 131 *n.*
— General Chapter of English Premonstratensians at, 11–13
Lincolnshire, convent of canonesses in, 4
Lisieux, John of, 196 *n.*
Little Steping (Lincs.), manor of, manumission of villeins on, 280
Littleton on villeinage, 243, 252, 253, 257, 258
Livingstone, James, Earl of Newburgh, temporarily in command of the King's Guards in Flanders, 70, 73, 85, 99, 100, 103, 106
Llanarth, chensers at, 165
Llanbadarn, lead mine at, 145 *n.*
Llanblethian, fulling mill at, 156 *n.*, 158
Llandudno, Roman mines at, 122 *n.*
Llanegrin, mill of, 144 *n.*
Llanerchymedd (Anglesea), cloth market of, 159
Llanfrynach (Breconshire), Roman remains at, 122 *n.*
Llanfyllin, mines at, 123
Llanilar (Mevenydd), chensers in, 165 *n.*, 166 *n.*
Llannedu (in Lenghenydd), coal mines of, 147 *n.*
Llannfydd, Ivor of, poem to, 149 *n.*
Llanpumpsaint (Carmarthen), Roman levels near, 123 *n.*
Llanrhystyd (in Hanniniog), chensers at, 165 *n.*
— clothmen of, 157
Llanrwst, town of, 141
Llanthony, Abbey of, 144 *n.*
Llanvihangel y Creuddyn, chensers prohibited at, 166 n.
Llechryd (near Cardigan), fisheries at, 150
Llewelyn, Prince of Aberfraw, lord of Snowdon, 131 *n.*, 288
— David, son of, freedom of tolls granted to, 130 *n.*
— Madoc ap, rising of, 137 *n.*
Lockhart, Sir William, Colonel of Cromwellian regiment of foot in Flanders, 81, 82 *n.*, 85–87, 89, 90, 95, 96, 109, 110
Lockhart's regiment, 106
London, Bishop of, Elfweard, 36
— — — Roger, denounces Caorsins as usurers, 208
— corporation of, 184, 203 *n.*, 211, 212
— Council of, 44
— St. Bartholomew fair in, 159
— trade with Wales, 167, 168 *n.*
Long, Sir H., appointed to treat for manumission of villeins, 277
Long Bennington (Lincs.), survey of manor of, 265, 266, 271 *n.*, 273–276
Lords, House of, and the villeins, 243
Lorenzo, Vermeio, Roman merchant, 196, 197 *n.*
Louvain, Irish regiment at, 74
Lovetot, John de, 212

Low, Thomas le, of Newark, safe-conduct to, 146 *n.*
— — — — — Robert, son of, 146 *n.*
Luca, Natalis, financier of Lucca, 182 *n.*
Lucca, Luca de, receives tally for part payment of loan, 192, 200 *n.*
— merchants of, loans of, 175, 183, 197 *n.*, 205, 214
— Ricciardi of, 197 *n.*, 201
Lylburn in Northamptonshire, manor of, 250
Lylie, John, farmer of royal iron forges in Nantconway, 147 *n.*
Lyons, Agobard of, 38

MABELWERN, chensers at, 165 *n.*
MacCarty, Charles (or Cormac), son of Lord Muskerry, lieutenant-colonel of Duke of York's regiment in Flanders, 68 *n.*, 71, 71 *n.*, 74, 85
MacCarty, Charles, son of, 74
Machynlleth, Montgomeryshire, mines at, 123 *n.*
Maghay (Magor), fulling mills at, 156 *n.*
Magicians and sorcerers, laws against, 40
'Magister Andreas contra Judeos,' 64 *n.*
Magna Carta, 176, 205
Maine, Geoffrey of, appointed master of grammar school of St. Albans, 46
Mainz, Archbishop of, Rabanus Maurus, teaching of, followed by Ælfric, 38
Maldon, Premonstratensian monastery at Bileigh, near, 3
Malmesbury, Abbot of, Ælfric, 28, 29
— — — and *v. sub* Carter.
— — — Godfrey, from Jumièges, 44
— Abbey, lands of, 26
— William of, 40, 45, 46, 56, 57, 59, 60
Man, Isle of, lead from, 146 *n.*
Manafon (Powysland), fulling mills at, 157 *n.*, 158
Manchester cotton trade, 169
— the Owens College in, ix.
Manorial accounts of bondship in Glamorgan, 138
Manorial system, 254
Manors of the Crown, bondmen at the, 248
Marcher districts of Wales (Marches of Wales), cloth-weaving in the, 156, 160
— — — — coal fields in the, 147 *n.*
— — — — lawlessness in the, 170, 171
— — lords of the, 132, 133, 171
— — lordships of the, 129, 132, 133, 162
— — merchants of the, 160
— — towns of the, 129, 130, 132, 158, 162, 170, 171
Marches, President and Council of, 171, 172, 261, 262
Mardyke, 76, 84, 86, 89, 103, 105, 106
— siege of, 82, 83
Mareys, Hugh le, merchant, 138
Margam Abbey, fishing rights of, 149
— — monks of, 142
Markets of Wales, 128, 164
— of Flanders, wool trade with, 152
Marmoutier, monks of, come to Battle Abbey, 44
Marshall, William, senior, account of, 188 *n.*
Marsilio, Gualtero and Vallianto, sons of, Florentine merchants, 194
Marteg (Radnorshire), Roman remains at, 122 *n.*
Martham (Norfolk), manor of, manumission of villeins on, 279
Martin, Master, clerk to Pope Innocent IV., 208 *n.*
Masonry, art of, introduced into Wales, 128, 129
Mass-priests to keep free schools, 35
Mathavarn, quarry of, millstones from the, 144 *n.*
Maurus, Rabanus, Archbishop of Mainz, teaching of, 39
Mazarin, Philippe Jules Mancini, Duc de, Cardinal, 71, 81, 95, 100
Medicine, practice of, forbidden to monks by Lateran Council, 54
Melindref and Llanybyther (Cardiganshire), chensers at, 165 *n.*
'Memoriale' of Benedict of Aniane, 31

Menai Straits, 170 *n.*
Mercatores domini papæ, 206
Merchant gilds in Wales, 163
Merchants, arrest of, in Wales, 171
— of the king, 205, 206
— Italian, 175–224
'Merchet,' villein fine, 238, 247, 248, 265
Mercia, monasteries of, affiliated to Abingdon, 29
'Mercurius Politicus,' 72
Meredith, Philip ap, farms fulling mill at Knighton, 157 *n.*
Merioneth, cloths exported from, 159
Merionethshire hills, gold in the, 123 *n.*
Mersforde (Denbigh), fulling mill in, 157 *n.*
Merton, school at, in which Thomas à Becket was educated, 52
Middleton, lieutenant-general of the Scottish regiment raised in Flanders, 69, 70, 70 *n.*, 73, 95
Mid-Welsh trade, centres of, 130, 131
Mildenhall, school at, 51
Mildmay, Sir W., commissioner to inquire into condition of bondmen on Crown manors, 269
Milford, 170, 170 *n.*
— merchants of, 169
Millstones from South Wales, 144
Mines in Wales, Crown profits from, 145 *n.*
— — — Crown rights of, 142
— — — profits of, 143–148
— — — worked by Romans, 122
Mint at Chester, 134 *n.*
— — Dublin, 199
— — Hereford, 134 *n.*
— — Llandaff, 134 *n.*
— — London, 213
— — Newcastle, 199 *n.*
— — Rhuddlan, 134 *n.*
— — Shrewsbury, 134 *n.*
Miracles, belief in, 53
Misæ Roll, 196
Miskin (Glamorgan), fulling mills at, 156 *n.*
— — Roman remains at, 122 *n.*
Model, the New, 96
'Modus tenendi curiam baronis,' by Fitzherbert, 242
Monasteries, dissolution of the, 236, 240, 245, 264, 288
— founded under Norman kings, 24, 44
Monastic charters, 149
— orders, spread of new, 62
Monasticism, English, the intellectual influence of, 23–65
— — revivals of, 23, 24, 39, 41, 42, 44
Monck, George, General, 77, 78, 92, 93, 96, 97 *n.*, 101
— — — Duke of Albemarle, 103, 108
Monmouth, Geoffrey of, 'Historia Britonum' by, 58, 59
— Roman mines at, 122 *n.*
Monmouthshire, collieries in, 147
— moors of 137
Montacute, Prior of, summoned before barons for debt, 204
Montaperti, defeat of Guelfs at, 214
Montgomery, burgesses of, 164
— fairs of, 131 *n.*
— lead mines in, 145
— woods in, 139
Montmédy, capture of, 82
Mont St. Michel, Scotland of, appointed Abbot of St. Augustine's, 44
Moors in Tangiers, ambuscade by, 107
— — — Lord Teviot killed by the, 109
Mora, Poncius de, grant to, 197 *n.*
More, Jankyn, farmed Pembroke collieries, 147 *n.*
Morgan, M. G., Major-General, 80
— Sir Thomas, Major-General, 77, 86, 90, 91
Morganwg, fulling mills at, 156
Mortimer, Sir Edmund, servants of, attack Welsh merchants, 130 *n.*
Morton, John, Bishop of Ely, 277, 278
Mostyn (Flintshire), colliery at, 146
— — — — profits from, 146 *n.*
Mount Cassel, capture of Gloucester's regiment at, 85
Moyle, T., surveyor of attainted estates of Glastonbury Abbey, 264
Mozzi, Florentine merchants, export of wool by the, 201 *n.*
Mulgrave, Lord, regiment of, 78 *n.*

Murdac, Henry, Abbot of Fountains, appointed Archbishop of York, 62
Musciatto (Monseigneur Mouche), 178, 179
Music, theory of, taught in monastic schools, 34
Muskerry, Lord, *v. sub* MacCarty.
Musselburgh, battle of, 77

NAMUR, 102
Nantconway, iron forges in, 147 *n.*
Nativè tenens, 249
Nativi tenentes, 249, 250 *n.*
'Naturalisation' of villeins, 265
Neath, 123
— Lower, coal mines in, 147 *n.*
Neckham, Alexander, master at school at Dunstable, 50, 52
Netheway *v.* Jorge, case of, 263, 264
Neubaud, Geoffrey de, 212
Neubo, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3
Newburgh, Earl of, *v. sub* Livingstone.
— William of, 54, 57, 58, 64
— — — description of Wales by, 137
— — — style of, 59
Newcastle Emlyn, fulling mills at, 157
Newcastle-upon-Tyne, customs collected at, 200, 200 *n.*
— — — Exchange at, 199
— — — Mint of, 199 *n.*
New College, Oxford, manumission of villeins on manor of Colern by, 277
'New Custom' on wools and hides, 182, 183
Newhouse (in Lincolnshire), Premonstratensian monastery at, 3
— — — the Abbot of, 14
New Minster, Abbot of, Ethelgar, 29
— — first monks of, 29
Newport, Adam of, 129 *n.*
Newport (Mon.), 144 *n*
— — chensers at fair of, 166
New Temple at London 191
Newtown (Powysland), fulling mill at, 157 *n.*, 158
— — market at, 164
Newtown Park, mines at, 123
Nicholas, Sir Edward, 97
Nieuport, Spaniards approach, 103
Nivelles, 99, 102
Norden, John, on villeinage, 240-242, 245
Norfolk rebellion led by Ket, 268
Norfolk rebels demand emancipation of bondmen, 243, 251
Norman abbots and bishops, 43, 44
— conquest, 33, 41, 42, 54, 57, 59, 65, 288
— — effect of, in Wales, 125, 129, 135, 155
— — revival of monasticism in England following, 23, 24
Normandy, monasteries of, reformed as model of Cluny, 60
— vigour of the Church in, 43
Northampton, Council of, in 1164, 62
— Welsh corn trade to, 159
Nottingham, 21
Nottinghamshire, convent of canonesses in, 4
Northumberland, sheriff of, 19
Norton (near Presteign), fulling mills at, 157 *n.*
— — — quarries at, 144
Norwich, St. William of, miracles of, 64
Norwich, John Kinge of, 253 *n.*
Norwood, Henry, Lieutenant-Colonel, Lieutenant-Governor of Tangiers, 107, 109
'Novel Natura Brevium,' by Fitzherbert, 242

OBLATES, school for, at Bec, 30, 49
Odo, second Abbot of Cluny, *v. sub* Cluny, Abbot of.
Odo, Archbishop of Canterbury, *v. sub* Canterbury, Archbishops of.
Offa's Dyke, building of, 124
'Ogafan' gold mines, 123 *n.*
Orange, William, Prince of, 78 *n.*
Ordovices withdraw to Wales, 121
'Organon,' the, 47
Orlandi, Armand, Florentine banker, receiver of the French king's money, 179

Orlandi, Reniero, Roman merchant, 197 *n*
Orleans, Theodulf of, 35
Ormond, Duke of, colonel of Irish regiment in Flanders, *v. sub* Butler, James.
Ormsby, court roll of manor of, 267
Orvieto, Edward I. at, 185 *n.*
Osbern, Precentor of Canterbury, 33
— — — — 'Life of St. Dunstan,' by, 58
— — — — 'Lives of Saints,' by, 55
— — — — style of, 59
Osgar, Abbot of Abingdon, *v. sub* Abingdon, Abbot of.
Osney, Abbot of, bond of the, 207
Ossory, Lord, 108
Oswestry Castle, Shrewsbury, burgesses imprisoned in, 171 *n.*
— — market of, 159, 164
— — merchants of, 160, 161
Oudekirke, near Dunkirk, English Royalists at, 83 *n.*
Owen, Cadwalader and Maurice, sons of, 157 *n.*
Owen, George, historian of Pembrokeshire, 160
Oxford, Council of, in 1166 condemn German Paulicians, 54

Packer, Colonel, 91, 93
Page, Dr., essays on villeinage, 237, 238
Pain's Castle, 129, 157 *n.*, 166
— — chensers at, 166
Palmer, David le, merchant, 138
Palmieri (*le Palmer*), Gregorio, Sienese banker, 190, 203 *n.*
Papacy, Benedictines seek new privileges from the, 63
— Henry III.'s alliance with the, 195, 196
— Hildebrandine conception of the, 59, 60
— opposes Konradin IV., 179
— relations of Church in England to, 41–43, 60
— supremacy of the, 41
Paris, Matthew, 180, 196, 196 *n.*, 209, 213
Paris, charge for transmission of money to, 189 *n.*
— treaty of, 1657, 76
— University of, Abbot Samson at the, 50, 51
— — — Alexander Neckham, a master of the, 50
— — — John de Cella, Abbot of St. Alban's, a master of the, 46
— — — schoolmasters from, 52
Parkeman, villein regardant to Gymyngham manor, case of, 264 *n.*
Parliament, 91, 92, 97
— the Long, 89, 95, 97
— rolls of, 171
Passelewe, Robert, 203 *n.*
— Simon, 185 *n.*
'Passio Sancti Edmundi,' 28, 29
Pastorello, merchant of Piacenza, 196
Paul of Caen appointed Abbot of St. Albans, 44
Paulicians, German, 54
Pearson, Lieutenant-Colonel, 91, 93
Peasants, rising of 1381 of the, 235
Peasants' war in Germany, 288
Peche, Bartholomew, 197 *n.*
Peck, Francis, antiquary, 4, 5
— — MS. of, 5–7
— — his transcript of the 'Registrum Premonstratense,' 7, 8
Pelagius, Alvarus, canonist, 209
Pembroke, chensers at fair of, 166
— colliery in, 146, 146 *n.*
— earls of, forest rights of, 140
— fulling mills at, 156
— millstones sent to, 144 *n.*
— weaving at, 156
Pembrokeshire, 123 *n.*
— Flemish artisans in, 156
— fulling mills in, 156 *n.*, 157 *n.*
Pennaghno in Nantconway, royal forge at, 147 *n.*
Pennant, forest of, fulling mill in the, 158
Pepper, Colonel, 85
Pepys, Samuel, diary of, 96
Periam, Mr. Justice, case of, 262
Périgordais, R. de Breuellio, seneschal of the, 179 *n.*

Peterborough Abbey, Abbot of, Adulf, 29
— — — — Benedict, 47
— — continuation of Anglo-Saxon chronicle by monks of, 39
— — first monks of, 29
— — gift of books from Athelwold to, 34
— — library of, 47
— — school of, 32
— — Wulfstan educated in, 43
— Earl of, Governor of Tangiers, 107
Peters, Mr. Hugh, 78
Petitions concerning bondmen, 259–261
'Petrus Aleunei contra Judeos,' 64 *n.*
Petrushevsky, Professor, 252, 254
Piacenza, bankers of, 194, 196
— — — Scotti, 185 *n.*
Pickering, survey of forest of, 242
Pilgrimage of grace, 251
Pilgrims, Irish, to Glastonbury, 26
Piracy in Irish Channel, 170, 171
Pistoia, bankers of, 206
Plangburn, Paganus, 196 *n.*
Plebano, Giovanni di Paolo di, lends money to Richard I., 193
Plinlimmon hills (Morruge), lead mines in, 145
Poggio, Orlandino di, 182 *n.*, 200, 201, 206 *n.*
Poitou, goods imported into Wales from, 167 *n.*
Poland, Middleton sent on a mission to, 70
Pollard, R., surveyor of attainted estates of Glastonbury Abbey, 264
Pollards, license to purchase, 199
Pope, the, recognised as supreme arbiter, 63
Pope Alexander III., canonisation of Edward the Confessor by, 64
— — — decree of, 51
— Alexander IV., 180
— Calixtus II., letter to, from Ralph, Archbishop of Canterbury, 61
— Clement IV., 215 *n.*
Pope Clement V., 16
— Eugenius III., a Cistercian, 62
— Gregory VII. (Hildebrand), 45
— — — conception of papacy of, 59
— — — death of, 60
— Innocent III., canonisation of Gilbert of Sempringham by, 64
— John XII. bestowed pall on Dunstan, 41
— Urban II. recognised by Anselm, 60
— Urban IV., 214, 215 *n.*
— — — recommends the Bonsignori to Henry III., 210
Porrée, Gilbert de la, 'Commentary on the Psalter' by, 47
Portugal, 110
— trade with Wales of, 160 *n.*, 167, 169
Powys, cloths exported from, 159
Powysland, fulling mills of, 157
— trade of, 164
Predestination, doctrine of, 38, 39
Premonstratensian Order in England, 1–22, 24, 48
— — — — abbots of, excommunicated, 11, 15
— — — — convents of canonesses, 4
— — — — general chapter of, 11
— — — — list of houses of, 3
— — — — registers of the, 4
— — — — visitation of the, 14
Premonstratensians at Vienne, 15
Prémontré, Abbey of, its claims over English houses, 8–20
— Abbot of, 6, 14, 15
— — — Adam de Crécy, 10, 11
— — — Herbert, 19, 20
— canons of, 2, 3
— canonesses of, 3
— foundation of new Order at, 2
Prerogatives, royal, in hands of king's merchant, 205
Presidential Address, by Dr. G. W. Prothero, vii–xxxiv.
Prest, the Great, 186 *n.*
Prests, 183
Pride, Colonel, 77
Priests, married, 23

Priests, mass, to keep free schools, 35
— parish, 25
— secular, 25, 26, 31
Priories, alien, 60
Priscian, text-book used in monastic schools, 31, 33, 37
Privy Council, Acts of the, 261, 262
Pulci, Florentine merchants, export of wool by the, 201 *n.*
Puleston, John, farms sea-coal at Blym, 60, 146 *n.*
Pulie, coal mines at, 147 *n.*
Pullen, Henry, villein of manor of High Easter, 270

QUADRIVIUM, 26, 33
'Quæstiones Grammaticales,' by Abbo, 28
Quarries in Wales, 144
Queen's Regiment, *v. sub* Second Regiment.

RADNOR, fulling mills of, 157
— Norman and English settlers in, 124
— sheep of, 152
Ralltissa in Tregynon, fulling mill at, 157 *n.*
Ramsey Abbey, Abbot of, Abbo, 28, 29, 30 *n.*
— — — — — appointed teacher of, 28
— — chroniclers of, 56
— — court rolls of, 264
— — founding of, 27
— — monk of, Eadnoth, later Bishop of Dorchester, 36
— — — — Elfweard, later Bishop of London, 36
— — — — Etheric, later Bishop of Dorchester, 36
— — — — Goscelin, 55
— — monks of, 29, 30
— — Prior of, Germanus, 30
— — school of, 27, 28, 33
— — Winsig, Prior of Worcester, trained at, 30
Rates of transmission of money, 189 *n.*
Ratramnus, works of, not regarded as heretical, 38, 39
Reading, Abbey of, 185 *n.*
— — — catalogue of library of, 64
Recognisances to Italian merchants *temp.* Ed. I., 204, 205, 213
Redburn, tithes of, assigned for procuring books for St. Albans, 45
Redman, Bishop of Exeter, *v. sub* Exeter, Bishop of.
Reformation, Protestant writers of, quote Ælfric, 38
Regiments, history of English, in Flanders, 67–119
'Registrum Premonstratense,' 4, 5, 7, 8
Relics, worship of, 41
Rembertini, Florentine merchants, export of wool by the, 201 *n.*
Renieri, Godofredo, Sienese banker, 196 *n.*
Requests, Court of, 288, 289
— — — suit concerning villeinage at the, 263, 264
Restoration, the, 67, 101
Reve, John, villein of the manor of Sutton, 276 *n.*
Revolution, the Great, 106 *n.*
Reynolds, Sir John, commander-in-chief of Cromwell's contingent to aid French, 77–82, 83 *n.*, 84
Rhayader, 158
— chensers at, 166
Rhodes, Mr. W. E., on Italian bankers, 186, 186 *n.*
Rhuddlan, 170
— ironworks at, 147 *n.*
— mint at, 134 *n.*
— Norman and English settlers at, 124
— woolstaple at, 151, 152 *n.*
Rhymney, forest of (Monmouthshire), colliery in, 147
— fulling mill at, 156 *n.*
— mill of, 144 *n.*
Rhys, Meredydd ap, poet, 149 *n.*
Ricciardi of Lucca, bankers, 178, 189 *n.*, 201, 205 *n.*, 211, 216
— — — — fall of the, 217

Rinaldi, Meo, Sienese merchant, 215 *n.*
— Stricca, Sienese merchant, 215 *n.*
Ripon, monastery at, 34
Roads made by Romans, 122
Roath, manor of, 156 *n.*
Robyn, R., farmed Pembroke collieries, 147 *n.*
Roch, coal mines at, 147 *n.*
Rocheamadour, letter dated from, 179 *n.*
Rochelle, trade with Wales, 9, 167 *n.*
Rochester, 70 *n.*
— Abbey, library of, 47, 64
— Bishop of, Ælfstan, 28
— Cathedral, library of, 47, 47 *n.*
— Henry Wilmot, Earl of, 69, 69 *n.*
Rockingham, Council of, 60
Rogers, Prof. Thorold: his view of serfdom, 235, 236
Rolls, Close, 186 *n.*, 192, 193
— Issue Memoranda, 191
— Liberate, 186 *n.*, 192, 193
— Misæ, 196
— Patent, 186 *n.*, 192, 193
— Receipt, 181, 183, 184
Roman law of bondage, 239
— towns in Wales, decay of, 123 *n.*
Romans, departure from Britain of, 121
Romanuz, Bernardus de, 188 *n.*
Rome, appeals to, 61
— archbishops go to fetch their palls from, 41
— charge for transmission of money to, 189 *n.*
— expenses of envoys to, 188, 189
— merchants of, 195
Romney, trade with Wales of, 167 *n.*
Roses, wars of the, 154
Rotheram, Robert de, Canon of Beauchief, 13
Royal Historical Society, operations of the, vii, viii, ix.
— — — by-laws of the, viii.
Royalist army in Flanders, 68–119
Royalist rising of 1657, 9
— — — — preparations for, 74
Royalists in French service, 68
Ruabon (Denbighshire), 149 *n.*
— — iron forges at, 147 *n.*
Rumiliaco, Ralph de, Dean of Church of St. Mary of Troyes, 207
Rushall, R., of Elton, Notts, villein curate of Elton, 275 *n.*
Russets, Welsh, at Bartholomew Fair, 159
Rutherford, Earl of Teviot, Governor of Dunkirk, 102–104, 106, 107
— — — — Governor of Tangiers, 107, 109, 110
Ruthin, Court Rolls of, 157 *n.*
— cloth market in, 159
— tolls of, 159 *n.*
Rutland, Duke of, MSS. of, 5

Saer, John ap, 135 *n.*
St. Abbo, teacher of the school at Ramsey, 28
St. Adulf, Life of, by Folcard, Abbot of Thorney, 55
St. Agatha, Premonstratensian monastery at Easeby, of, 3
St. Albans (Verulam), 25
— — Abbey, 179 *n.*, 180 *n.*, 185 *n.*
— — — Abbot of, Eadmer, 25, 25 *n.*, 55–57, 59
— — — — — Geoffrey of Maine, 50
— — — — — John de Cella, 46
— — — — — Paul of Caen, 44, 45
— — — — — Richard, 80
— — — — — Simon de Gorham, 45
— — — — — Warin, 46, 50
— — — cell of, at Binham, 50
— — — learning of abbots of, 46
— — — library of, 47
— — — monks of, 25, 54
— — — register of, 269, 270
— — — schools attached to, 46, 50–52
— — — scriptorium founded by Abbot Paul, 45
St. Aldhelm, lives of, 58
St. Andrew, impostor appears as, 53
St. Anselm friendly towards the Jews, 64, 64 *n.*
St. Anselm, Life of, by Eadmer, 56
— — Meditations of, 47; and *v. sub* Canterbury, Archbishop of.

St. Asaph, Bishop of, free from tolls in Salop, 130 *n.*
— — — — Redman, 7
— — Cathedral of, restored by Bishop Redman, 7
St. Athelwold, 27, 53 *n.*; *v. also sub* Abingdon, Abbot of.
St. Augustine, 38
— — Life of, by Goscelin, 55
— — Rule of, 2
St. Augustine's Abbey, Scotland becomes abbot of, 44
St. Bartholomew Fair in London, 159
St. Benedict of Aniane, 31
— — — — Rule of, 25, 27, 31, 45, 54
— — — — works of, 30, 31 *n.*
St. Bernard, sermons of, 47
St. Botulf, life of, by Folcard, Abbot of Thorney, 55
St. Briavel, millstones from, 144 *n.*
St. Bruno, 35
St. David's, cathedral church of, 141
St. Dunstan, 33, 40
— — feast day of, 42
— — Lives of, 55, 58, 59; and *v. sub* Canterbury, Archbishops of.
St. Edmund, feast day of, 42
— — Life of, 59
— — Passio, 28
St. Edward the Confessor, 53 *n.*, 64
— — — — canonisation of, 64; and *v. sub* England, kings of.
St. Egidius, fair of, at Winchester, 131 *n.*
St. Elphege, life of, by Osbern, Precentor of Canterbury, 55
St. Ethelreda, life of, written by Goscelin at Ely, 55
St. Gall in Lombardy, Abbot of, 195 *n.*
St. Géraud in Brittany, trade with Wales, 167 *n.*
St. Germain, 'Doctor and Student,' by, 244
— — on villeinage, 243, 252, 253
St. Gilbert of Sempringham, 53 *n.*
— — — — aids Becket's escape, 63
— — — — canonisation of, 64
St. Gilbert of Sempringham, Life of, 56, 57
— — — — miracles of, 53 *n.*
St. Gobain, forest of, 2
St. Gremery de Lile de Bas Pays, trade with Wales of, 167 *n.*
St. Gyles Tydde, manor of, belonging to Bishop of Ely, 278
St. Harold of Gloucester martyred by the Jews, 64
St. Ivo, Life of, by Goscelin, 55
St. John of Beverley, Life of, by Folcard, Abbot of Thorney, 55
St. John's Bay, arrival of Cromwellian contingent at, 79
St. Nicholas, impostor appears as, 53
St. Norbert, 1, 9
— — parentage of, 1
— — Life of, 1, 2
St. Omer, 100
— — trade of, 131 *n.*
St. Oswald, life of, 28, 29, 55
— — revival of monasticism under, 29
St. Pancras Abbey, Lewes, Lanzo, Prior of, 44
St. Patrick, 124
— — the Younger, tomb of, 26
St. Quentin, Turenne at, 82
St. Radegund (or Bradsole), Premonstratensian monastery of, 3
— — Abbot of, 15, 16
St. Robert of Bury martyred by the Jews, 64
St. Thomas, Ælfric's version of the story of, 38
St. Thomas Aquinas, death of, 216
St. Thomas of Canterbury, miracles of, 53 *n.*; and *v. sub.* Canterbury, Archbishops of.
St. Venant, capture of, 82
St. Wilfrid, Life of, by Eadmer, Precentor of Canterbury, 55
St. William of Norwich martyred by the Jews, 64
St. Wulfstan, Life of, by Coleman of Worcester, 56
Saints, canonisation of, 63, 64
Sakevyle, Sir R., appointed Chancellor of Court of Augmentations, 264, 265

Salerno, University of, monks of St. Albans masters of, 54
— — — schoolmasters from, 52
— — — Warin, Abbot of St. Albans, a master of, 46, 50
Salimbene, Alessandro, Sienese banker, 196
Salkeld, Sir William, Major, 110
Salmon, Colonel, 84, 85, 88
— — regiment of, 92
Salop, Alexander de Swereford, Archdeacon of, 190
Salt imported into Wales, 125, 169
Samson, Abbot of Bury, *v. sub* Bury, Abbot of.
Sancto Albano, Henry de, Keeper of the Mint, 191
Sandale, John de, Keeper of the Mint in London, 213
Sarra, Giovanni di, Bolognese banker, lends money to Richard I., 193
Sarracenus, Peter, 197
'Scholæ canonicæ' in France, 30, 31
'Scholæ claustrales' in France, 30, 31
Schomberg, Frédéric Armand, Duc de, Marshal of France, commands garrison at St. Ghislain, 72
— — — — — governor of Calais, 100
School established by Irish at Glastonbury, 26
— free, every mass-priest to keep a, 35
— secular, usual adjunct of Benedictine monastery, 49
Schools, collegiate, supported by Canute, 36
— episcopal, 35, 36
— grammar, attached to houses of Austin canons, 49, 51
— — curriculum in, 49, 52
— — founded by Canute, 36
— in England, 30, 31, 32, 36
— in France, 26, 30, 31
— monastic, 26, 33, 35, 36, 49, 65
Scot, Clement the, 26
— John the, *v. sub* Scotus, Joannes.
Scotland, Abbot of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, 44
— King of, David, 3
Scotland, Premonstratensians in, 3
Scots serving in Swedish armies, 70
Scotti of Piacenza lend money to Edward I., 185 *n.*
Scottish merchants in Danzig, Charles II. tries to raise loan from, 70
— rebels plunder ships off Holyhead, 170 *n.*
Scotus, Joannes, 26
Scriptorium founded at Abingdon, 46
— — at St. Albans by Abbot Paul, 45
Scrovigni, Reginaldo, of Padua, usurer, 217
Second or Queen's regiment, 105, 108
— — — — origin of the, 110
Seebohm, Dr., views on villeinage of, 287, 288
Segar, T., claimed as manorial bondman by Lord Stafford, 262
Seignorial rights, non-user of, gives legal freedom to villein, 237
Selvaggi, Iseberto, banker of Piacenza, 194
Sempringham, bond of Prior and Convent of, 196 *n.*
— Gilbert of, *v. sub* St. Gilbert.
Senghenydd (Monmouthshire), forest of, colliery in the, 147
— — — — profits of the, 143 *n.*
Serfdom, 237; *v. sub* Villeinage.
Servat, William, merchant of Cahors, 204 *n.*
'Servi,' 235
— under Roman law, 239
Services, villein, 249 *n.*
— — commutation of, 237, 238
Severn, river, fisheries of the, 149
— — wools from district of the, 159
Shap or Heppa, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3, 6
Shapwike, manor of (in Duchy of Lancaster), 267
Sheep, Welsh, 152
Sheep-farming, staple industry of Wales, 139
Shelebel, Raniero, Italian banker, 190
Sherborne Abbey, lands of, 25, 26
— Bishop of, Wulsy, 29

Shoreham, licence to Italians to lade wool at, 208 *n.*
Shrewsbury, 132 *n.*, 170
— burgesses of, arrested, 171 *n.*
— — — receive toll from Welshmen, 130
— clothiers of, 159
— market for Welsh cloth at, 159
— merchants of, 160, 161
— mint at, 134 *n.*
— trade of, 130
— wool staple established at, 151
Shropshire, lead mines in, 145
Sicilian expedition, 185
Sicily, 178, 181, 195, 195 *n.*
— corn supplies from, 214
— crown of, accepted by Edmund, son of Henry III., 179
— king of, Manfred, recognised by Sienese, 214, 215
— relations between England and Norman kingdom of, 54
Siena, archives of, 196 *n.*
— Bonsignori of, 211
— Council of Twenty-four of, 214
— merchants of, 178, 179, 194–196, 203 *n.*, 206, 214
— — — banished by Henry III., 209 *n.*
Sigeric, Archbishop of Canterbury, *v. sub* Canterbury, Archbishop of.
Silures withdraw to Wales, 121
Silver mines in Cardiganshire, 148
Simon de Gorham, *v. sub* St. Albans, Abbot of.
Simonetta, Donato, Florentine merchant, 208 *n.*
Slate in North Wales, 144
Slave trade in Wales, 124
Smith, Sir Thomas, author of 'Commonwealth of England,' 239, 240, 245, 258, 287
Smithe, T., claimed as manorial bondman by Lord Stafford, 262
Smyth, J., steward of Berkeley Hundred, 244, 245 *n.*, 246, 250
Snowdon, forest of, 141
'Societas Ricardorum,' 175
Soloficci, Angelerio, and partners, Sienese bankers, 195 *n.*
Somerset, sheriff of, order to deliver lead-miners to Hugh le Despenser, 143
Somersett's case, suit under law of villeinage, 256
Somersetshire, Crown manors in, 269
Sorcerers and magicians, laws against, 40
Sourton, villeins of, 252
South Irvon (Brecon), ironworks at, 148 *n.*
South Wales, Adam of, 129
— — coalfields of, 161
— — merchants of, 169
Spada, Guido della, Florentine merchant, 208 *n.*
Spain, 95
— heresy in, 54
— hostile relations with France of, 67, 68, 75, 100, 101
— king of, Philip IV., makes treaty with Charles II., 68
— — — — — supports Charles II., 67, 68, 68 *n.*
— Welsh trade with, 148, 160, 167, 169
Spalding, Lincs., manor of, manumission of villeins on, 279
Spalding, Robert de, canon of Croxton, 13
Spandi, Gerardo degli, banker of Piacenza, 194
Spanish army in Flanders, 68, 74–76
— — — — defeat of, 86
— iron, import of, 148
Spinelli, Ranuccio, Sienese merchant, 208 *n.*
Spini, Florentine merchants, export of wool by the, 201 *n.*
Stafford, Edward, Duke of Buckingham, manumission of villein by, 269
— — — — — Alienore, wife of, 269
— — 11th Baron Stafford, suit against mayor of Bristol as villein regardant, 261, 262, 277
Stafford, fair at, 131 *n.*
— Welsh coal trade to, 159

Stanley Park, or Dale, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3
Staping, Master William de, proctor of English Premonstratensians at Vienne, 17
Staple Ordinance of the, 152
— towns, English, Welsh merchants come to, 152, 153
— — in Wales, 151
Star Chamber, Court of, 288, 289
Stathame, T., villein on manor of Long Bennington, 274
Statute 28 Edward II., 'De falsa moneta,' 212
— 23 Edward III., 'Statute of labourers,' 250, 252, 255–257
— 25 Edward III., 258
— 1 Richard II., 259
— 9 Richard II., 259, 260
Statutes forbidding Welshmen to become burgesses of English borough, 162, 163
— of labourers, 250, 252, 254–257
Stavenby, Alexander de, Bishop of Coventry, 190
Steiland, Simon, 197
Stephen, Pope's chaplain, 196
Stranger merchants, law against, 203 *n.*
Strata Florida, Abbey of, 149
— — district of, 145 *n.*
Stuart dynasty, 235
— — cause of the, 100, 101
Style of monastic writers, 57, 59, 65
Subsidies, English Premonstratensian, abbots refuse to pay to Prémontré, 10, 11
— Edward II. prohibits payment of, to Prémontré, 12, 13
Sulby or Welford, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3
— — — — — — — abbot of, sent as proctor to Prémontré, 10, 11, 13
Sulphur brought from London to Wales, 167
Superstitions fostered by the Church, 40, 41
'Surveyinge,' authorship of, 240, 241, 245
Surveys, 247
Sussex, manor of Falmer in, 242
Sutton, Lincolnshire, manor of, 250 *n.*
Swansea, 162, 170
— charters to burgesses of, 139, 140
— fulling mill of, 156 *n.*
— origin of name, 125
Swedish service, Scots in the, 73
Swereford, Alexander de, Archdeacon of Salop, appointed King's Proctor at Rome, 190

TAAFFE, Theobald, Lord Viscount, in command of Irish regiment in Flanders, 71, 73
Taaffe, William, colonel of Irish regiment in Flanders, 71, 104, 105
Taff, river, fisheries of the, 149
Talgarth, limestone quarry at, 144 *n.*
Tangiers, 105, 109, 110
— garrison at, 107
Taunton abbey, lands of, 25, 26
— spears brought from Wales to, 131 *n.*
Teify, river, salmon fishery of, 150
Teilo, 134 *n.*
'Teithi,' the, 127
Tenby, 170 *n.*
— fair, chensers at, 166
— herring fishery of, 156
— merchants of, 169
Tenths and fifteenths, 183
Text-books used in monastic schools, 33
Theodulf of Orleans, capitulary of, 35
Thetford, Bishop of, Herfast, 53
'Third Order,' 2
Thomas, Meredith ap, farms North Wales slate quarries, 144
Thornbury (Glouc.), manor of, 261, 262
Thorney Abbey, abbot of, Folcard, 55
— — monks of, 29
— — William of Malmesbury's description of, 46
Throgmorton, Sir William, lieutenant of the king's own regiment in Flanders, 69, 73
Thurloe, John, Secretary of State, 81, 83 *n.*
Timber, supply of, from Welsh forests, 140

Tintern quarries, millstones from, 144, 144 *n.*
Titchfield, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3
Tolls paid by Welshmen, 130
Tolomei, Sienese merchants, 214, 215
— Andrea de', letter from, 215 *n.*
Torre, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3
Toscho, Guido, of Parma, 215 *n.*
Tournemyre, William de, merchant of Cahors, 204 *n.*
Tours, Berengar of, his controversy with Lanfranc, 38, 39
— John of, *v. sub* Bath, Bishop of.
Towns, foundation of, in Wales, 127–129
Towy, forest of, clearing of, 139
— river of, used for transport of stone to Caermarthen, 141
Treaty with France negotiated by Cromwell, 1655, 67, 68
— of Paris, 1657, 76
— of the Pyrenees, 1659, 77
— with Spain negotiated by Charles II., 68
Trefriw, town of, 141
Tribal economy of Wales, 121–136, 137
Tribute paid by Welsh princes, 124
Trillek (Monmouthshire), millstones from quarries of, 144
Trivium and Quadrivium taught in monastic schools, 26, 28, 33
Troyes, Dean of Church of St. Etienne of, 207
— — — — — St. Mary of, Ralph de Rumiliaco, 207
Tudor age, 235
Tudors, bondmen under the, 235–289
Tupholine, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3
Turenne, Henri de la Tour d'Auvergne, Marshal of France, Vicomte de, 76, 82, 85, 87, 90, 106
Turin, 180
— Claudius of, 38
Tyler, Wat, rebellion of, 259
Udalric, 30
Ughaph, commote of, fulling mill in the, 158
Ugolini, Chiaro, of Florence, 191, 197
Uguiccione, Jacopo, Sienese banker, 196
— Tengo, Sienese banker, 215 *n.*
Ulster, 78
Universities, rise of the, 52, 65
Upton, Notts, lands bought by a villein in, 274
— Thomas de, first controller of customs for North Wales, 151 *n.*
Urry, Sir William, colonel of Lord Newburgh's regiment, 85
Usk, fulling mills at, 156 *n.*
Usurers, mandate for expulsion of, 211, 212
— — — — — Italians banished under the, 209
Usury, 185, 208, 214
— definition of, under common law, 209
— laws evaded by partnership, 210
— practised by Italian bankers, 208
Valence, William, Bishop of, 179, 179 *n.*, 180 *n.*, 197
Vaynol, lead mines at, 145 *n.*
Venner's insurrection, 101
Venturi, Federigo, of Lucca, 201
Verulam, 25; and *v. sub* St. Albans.
Vienne, General Council at, 15, 16, 18
'Villani custumarii,' 235, 251
Villeinage, decay of, 236, 246, 288
— law of, 252–258
— lawsuits concerning, 255–258
Villein families, estimate of numbers of, 247
— tenure, 238
Villeins, 235
— flights of, 237
— goods of, 272
— in gross, 239
— manumission of, 237, 239, 240, 243, 247, 256, 257, 268, 269, 288
— — — charters of, 247, 269

Villeins, manumission of, commission for, 271
— — — fine for, 238, 270
— meaning of the term, 251
— petitions to House of Commons concerning, 259
— regardant, 239
— unable to leave manor without licence, 265, 266
— status of, evidence of manorial rolls, 264, 265
— statutes concerning, 260, 261
Vinogradoff, Professor, 252, 257, 287
'Vitæ Patrum' by Ælfric, 38
Vulpelli, Labrus, and partners, Roman bankers, 189 *n.*
Vyrnwy, valley of the, wools produced in the, 159

Wales, 126, 133, 141, 151, 155, 168, 170
— agriculture in, 126, 136–139, 154
— Church of, 124
— coalfields in, 146, 147
— commerce of, 121–173
— commercial privileges in, 131
— currency of, 134, 134 *n.*
— divisions of, 170
— Edward I.'s expedition against, 184 *n.*, 185 *n.*
— English congresses in, 167
— — conquest of, 128, 132, 288
— external trade of, 166–173
— feudal system in, 155
— fisheries of, 149–150
— forests of, 139–148
— free boroughs in, 164
— history of weaving industry of, 155
— imports of, 166–173
— insurrections in, 167 *n.*, 168 *n.*
— laws of, 127
— — — old codes of, 142
— marches of, 129–133
— markets and fairs in, 164
— Mid, 170
— North, principality of, 170
— — disfranchised by Henry VI., 163
— Prince of, Llewelyn, 288
Wales, quarries in, 144
— relations with Ireland of, 124, 125
— scarcity of labourers in, 143
— silver mines in, 148
— small sheep of, 162
— South, coalfields of, 147, 147 *n.*
— — lordships of, 170
— — merchants of, 169
— town life in, 161–166
— trade of, 124, 127, 128, 131 *n.*, 143, 151–161, 166–173
— tribal economy of, 121–136, 137
— union of, 121, 173
— — — act of, 153–156, 173
— waterways of, 141
— wool trade in, 131 *n.*, 151–161
Walter, a monk of Bury, a renowned doctor, 53
Waltham, Augustinian canons at, 36, 51, 185 *n.*
Warthrinnion, merchants of, 130 *n.*
— mining rights of, 142 *n.*
Warwick, Welsh cloth trade to, 159
Wax imported into Wales, 148
Waythall, Lincs., manor of, manumission of villeins in, 280
Wearmouth, Benedictine Abbey at, 27
Welbeck, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3
Welford, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3
Welsh a pastoral people, 127
Welshmen forbidden to become burgesses of the English boroughs, 162, 163
Welshpool, cloth market at, 159, 164
— fair, 171 *n.*
Wendling, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3
Wendraeth Vawr, coal mines of, 147 *n.*
Wenlock Abbey, lands of, 25, 26
Wentworth, Lord, command of the guards erroneously assigned by Clarendon to, 69*n.*, 73, 101, 102
— — death of, 103
West Dereham, Premonstratensian monastery at, 3
Westbury Abbey, 30
— — Germanus, Prior of, 30

Westborough, in manor of Long Bennington, 274
West Indies, 110
Westminster Abbey, 185 *n*,
— Abbot of, Gilbert Crispin, 64, 64 *n*.
— — — Wulsy, Bishop of Sherborne, 29
— — Milo Crispin, monk of, 56
Weston, Hunts, manor of, 265
West Surrey regiment, 105, 110
Wheeler, Lieutenant-Colonel, 102
White, Francis, Colonel, 84
Whith, Jeuan, weaver of Anglesea, 158
Whithorne, case of, under law of villeinage, 261
Whitley Abbey, library of, 47
William, Archbishop of York, *v. sub* York, Archbishops of.
William of Malmesbury, *v. sub* Malmesbury.
Wilmot, Henry, Earl of Rochester, commands King's Own Regiment in Flanders, 69, 69 *n*., 73
Wilts, Welsh cloth trade to, 159
Winchester, 196 *n*.
— Abbey, lands of, 25, 26
— — library of, 37
— — monks of, 29
— — school attached to, 34
— Archdeacon of, 1219, 193
— Bishop of, Athelwold, 23–25, 27, 29–31, 34, 35
— Bishop of, Elfeah the Bald, 26, 27
— Bishop of, Henry, 62
— clerk of, Germanus, made Prior of Ramsey, 20
— fair of St. Giles at, 131 *n*.
Wine, prisage of, 168
— trade to Wales, 169, 170
Witan, feast days decreed by, 42
Witchcraft, denunciations of, 40
Witham Monastery, founding of, 48, 49
Wode, Richard de, escheator of Anglesea, 158
Woodham Ferrers, in Essex, manor of, 250
Wool, customs on, 151, 153, 202, 203
— — — the new, 182
— licences granted to Italian merchants for export of, 201
— staples in Wales, 151
Wool trade, 152, 154, 163, 176, 198, 208
— — of Wales, 131 *n*., 151–163
Wools, English, exported by Italian merchants, 208
— Welsh, poor quality of, 152
Worcester, Bishop of, Oswald, 27 ; and *v. sub* York, Archbishop of.
— — — Wulfstan, 31, 32, 43, 56
— Abbey, Coleman, a monk of, 56
— — Florence, a monk of, chronicler 56, 60
— — lands of, 25, 26
— — monks of, 55
— — — — continuation of Anglo-Saxon Chronicle by, 39
— — Prior of, Winsig, 30
— — Senatus Bravonius, a monk of, 59
— see of, held by Oswald jointly with see of York, 42
— Welsh cloth trade to, 159
Worde, Wynkyn de, 242
World, end of, in 1000 A.D., not generally believed in England, 39
Wormsley (Hereford), quarries of, 144
Wulfstan, *v. sub* Worcester, Bishop of.
Wye, fisheries of the river, 149

XANTEN, birthplace of St. Norbert, 1
— canons of, 2

YORK, Archbishop of, Henry Murdac, 62
— — — Oswald, 23, 24, 27, 30, 42
— — — William, death of, described by William of Newburgh, 58
— — — strife with Canterbury, 60, 61
— Hugh the Chanter of, chronicler, 60

York, James, Duke of, commands regiment in Flanders, 70–72, 74, 85, 86, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104; and *v. sub* England, King of, James II.
— secular canon of, anonymous treatise by, 61
— see of, disputed succession to, 62
York, see of, held by Oswald jointly with Worcester, 42
— unit of, 199 *n.*
Ypres, siege of, 86
Ystrad, Flur, Abbey of, 137
Ystwyth river, fishing rights on the, 149

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL, SESSION 1901–1902.

THE Council of the Royal Historical Society present their Annual Report to the General Meeting of the Fellows.

The following Papers and Communications were read during the past Session:—

"Some Materials for a New Edition of Polydore Vergil's 'History.'" By the Right Rev. Francis Aidan Gasquet, D.D.

"The International Organisation of the Merchant Adventurers of England." By W. E. Lingelbach, Ph.D.

"The High Court of Admiralty in relation to National History, Commerce, and the Colonisation of America, A.D. 1550–1650." By R. G. Marsden, M.A.

"The State Papers of the Early Stuarts and the Interregnum." By Mrs. S. C. Lomas.

"An Unknown Conspiracy against King Henry VII." By I. S. Leadam, M.A., Barrister-at-Law.

"England and the Emancipation of South America in the Eighteenth Century." By the Director.

The first five of the above have been printed in *Transactions*, N.S. Vol. XVI.

The President delivered his Annual Address on February 20, 1902. This has also been printed in *Transactions*, Vol. XVI.

The Alexander Medal for the year 1901 was awarded, on the recommendation of the Examiners, to Mr. Vincent B. Redstone, of Mood-bridge School, Hon. Sec. of the Suffolk Archæological Society, for the Essay on "The Social Condition of England during the Wars of the Roses," which has been printed in *Transactions*, Vol. XVI.

The following subjects were announced for the year 1902:—

"The Intellectual Influence of English Monasticism between the Tenth and Twelfth Centuries."

"The English Occupation of Tangiers, 1661–1683."

In addition to the current volume of *Transactions*, the following volumes of *Publications* have been issued to the Fellows and Subscribing Libraries:—

Camden Third Series, Vol. IV.—"The Camden Miscellany," Vol. X., containing the Journal of Sir Roger Wilbraham, edited by Mr. H. Spencer Scott; the Journal of Sir Thomas Thaby, edited by Mr. Edgar Powell; and "Prince Rupert at Lisbon," edited by the late S. R. Gardiner, D.C.L.

Camden Third Series, Vol. V.—"The Despatches of William Perwick from Paris, 1669–1678." Edited by Miss M. B. Curran.

The proceedings of the Committee for furthering Advanced Historical Teaching in London, which were referred to in previous Reports, have been described in the President's last Address.

The results of the Experimental Classes and Seminars held at the School of Economics have been submitted to the Committee, and are considered to be highly encouraging. The Council take this opportunity of calling the attention of the Fellows to the importance and value of the Scheme of Advanced Historical Teaching which has been set on foot by the Committee referred to, and wish to point out that continuance and expansion must depend almost entirely upon the voluntary support of Historical Scholars in this country.

During the past Session invitations were received for the attendance of Delegates of the Society at the Jubilee of Owens College, Manchester, the Tercentenary Commemoration of the Bodleian Library at Oxford, and the Centenary Commemoration of Dorpat University. Addresses were presented by the Delegates of the Society at the first two of these celebrations. The Council also prepared a loyal and dutiful Address to their Gracious Majesties King Edward VII. and Queen Alexandra on the occasion of their Coronation.

In accordance with a resolution of the Council the By-laws of the Society were revised and extensively amended throughout, and the Amendments proposed by the Council were submitted to a Special Meeting of the Society held on May 15, 1902, and were approved by the Meeting. As one result of these Amendments a new class of Honorary Vice-Presidents, limited to twenty-five, has been created; while the number of the ordinary Vice-Presidents has been reduced to eight, and that of Councillors to sixteen, of whom two and four respectively retire annually in rotation, but are re-eligible.

A Catalogue of the *Transactions* and other Publications of the Historical Societies at home and abroad which exchange with this Society has been printed in *Transactions* Vol. XVI., and active steps are being taken to complete the several series.

The Librarian reports that during the past Session 140 books and pamphlets have been added to the Library. Of the additions, 6 were acquired by purchase, and 132 by exchange and presentation. During the year ended October 31, 1902, 92 volumes were rebound.

During the past Session the Society has had to deplore the deaths of two more of its most distinguished Members. The

late Dr. S. R. Gardiner was for many years an active Vice-President, and one of the last of his published works appears in the recent volume of the Camden Series. The late Lord Acton was also during many years a Vice-President.

Reference has been made at some length in the President's last Address to the services rendered to English Historical Studies by these admirable scholars, no less than by the late Bishops of London and Oxford. As a slight memorial to the importance of their labours, the Council resolved to sanction the preparation of a Bibliography of the Historical Works of the four historians referred to, and this has recently been issued under the personal supervision of the President.

The Council have also to mention with regret the death of Mr. B. F. Stevens after a long and painful illness. Mr. Stevens was for many years a Member of the Council, and rendered valuable services as Chairman of the Finance Committee during a critical period of the Society's existence. Although he was a citizen of the United States, Mr. Stevens had resided in this country for more than thirty years, and his unfailing courtesy and generosity will make his loss felt by a wide circle of European students. Mr. Stevens possessed a unique knowledge of the sources of American History during the Revolutionary period. Mr. Stevens's place as Auditor for the Council has been filled by the election of Mr. W. J. Corbett, Fellow and Bursar of King's College, Cambridge.

Amongst the deaths reported during the past Session, which have been happily few in number, mention must also be made of those of Colonel John Davis, F.S.A., A.D.C. to the King, a military historian of great industry and one of the pioneers of the new system of compiling regimental histories from the actual records. In this respect Colonel Davis's "History of the Queen's Regiment" may fairly be regarded as a model.

By the regretted death of M. R. de la Clavière Maulde, Vice-President, and one of the founders of the *Société d'Histoire Diplomatique*, this Society loses one of its Corresponding Members.

In accordance with By-law IV. (of the old By-laws) the following Vice-Presidents retired in rotation :—

Lord Avebury.
Mr. Frederic Harrison.
The Warden of Merton College, Oxford.

All of the above were re-elected at the last General Meeting.

The following Members of the Council retired in rotation under the same By-law :—

Mr. C. Raymond Beazley.
Rev. J. F. Bright (Master of University College, Oxford).
Mr. W. H. Stevenson.
Professor T. F. Tont.

The following were elected and re-elected respectively at the General Meeting :—

Mr. C. Raymond Beazley.
Mr. W. H. Stevenson.
Sir F. Pollock, Bart.
Mr. Sidney Lee.

The Treasurer reports that the total membership of the Society on October 31, 1902, included 659 Honorary, Corresponding, Life, and Ordinary Fellows and Subscribing Libraries on the Roll. Of the above 28 are Honorary Fellows, 22 are Corresponding Members, 109 are Life Fellows, 64 are Ordinary Fellows paying £1. 1*s.* subscription under the old regulations, 251 are Ordinary Fellows paying £2. 2*s.* under the new regulations, 52 are former Members of the old Camden Society paying £1, and 133 are Subscribing Libraries who also pay £1, together with 63 British or Foreign Societies which exchange *Transactions* with the Society, and 6 Institutions to which the Society's *Transactions* or Publications are presented.

Attention has been called in the President's last Address to the large number of distinguished Historical Scholars who have joined the Fellowship of the Society during the past Session, and the Council wish this to be regarded as an indication of their determination to maintain a high standard of historical scholarship for the Fellowship of the Society, which claims to represent the general interests of historical students in this country by promoting the scientific study of History.

The Council append to their Report the Treasurer's statement of the financial position of the Society from November 1, 1901, to October 31, 1902.

They also append the official Information concerning the Society, the Charter, By-laws, List of Fellows, and Subscribing Libraries ; with a catalogue of the Publications of the Society, and a List of the Periodicals of Learned Societies in the Library.

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY. BALANCE-SHEET FOR THE YEAR ENDING OCTOBER 31, 1902.

1901.		£	s.	d.
Nov. 1 to Oct. 31, 1902.	To Balance at L. & S. W. Bank as per last Balance-Sheet	330	3	2
	,, Cash Subscriptions 1 at 20s. for 1899 . . 1 0 0			
	,, ,, 6 ,, 1900 . . 6 0 0			
	,, ,, 44 ,, 1901 . . 44 0 0			
	,, ,, 112 ,, 1902 . . 112 0 0			
	,, ,, 3 ,, 1903 . . 3 0 0			
	,, ,, 1 ,, 1904 . . 1 0 0			
	167 0 0			
	,, ,, 4 at 21s. for 1900 . . 4 4 0			
	,, ,, 15 ,, 1901 . . 15 15 0			
	,, ,, 61 ,, 1902 . . 64 1 0			
	,, ,, 2 ,, 1903 . . 2 2 0			
	86 2 0			
	,, ,, 1 at 42s. for 1898 . . 2 2 0			
	,, ,, 2 ,, 1899 . . 4 4 0			
	,, ,, 9 ,, 1900 . . 18 18 0			
	,, ,, 33 ,, 1901 . . 69 6 0			
	,, ,, 185 ,, 1902 . . 388 10 3			
	,, ,, [illegible] ,, 1903 . . 4 4 0			
	487 4 3			
		740	6	3
	,, ,, 8 Life	168	0	0
	,, Russian Dividends on Stock	3	14	2
	,, Publications Sold	66	9	10
	,, From Deposit Account for Investment	193	13	6
		£1,502	6	11

1901.		£	s.	d.
Nov. 1 to Oct. 31, 1902.	By Insurance	3	18	0
	,, Treasurer's Postages (2 years)	2	14	7
	,, Director's and Librarian's Salaries	176	0	0
	,, Binding Transactions, &c.	10	17	11
	,, Alexander Medals (2 years)	6	6	0
	,, Printing and Stationery	618	9	6
	,, Editing and Indexing	51	0	0
	,, Advertising	5	16	6
	,, Sundry Petty Cash Payments	59	0	10
	,, Subscriptions Refunded	4	5	0
	,, Refreshments	3	10	0
	,, Returned Cheque Unpaid Life Subscription . . .	21	0	0
	,, Societies' Subscriptions	4	5	0
	,, Rent, Rates, Taxes, Electric Light, and Coals . .	108	13	4
	,, Address on the King's Coronation	6	10	0
	,, Carriage of Transactions	2	19	7
	,, Cheque Book	0	8	4
	,, Two-thirds of Life Compositions to Deposit Account .	84	0	0
	,, Purchase of £200 Consols and Commission . . .	193	13	6
		1,363	8	1
Oct. 31	To Cash Balance at London and South Western Bank 137 18 10			
	,, ,, in hand 1 0 0			
		138	18	10
		£1,502	6	11

RESERVE FUND FOR THE YEAR ENDING OCTOBER 31, 1902.

	£	s.	d.
To Balance November 1, 1901	810	17	10
,, Dividends on £849. 9s. 9d. 2¾ % Consols 18 1 5			
,, Life Compositions 84 0 0			
,, Interest on Deposit at L. & S. W. Bank 3 0 9			
	105	2	2
	£916	0	0

1902.		£	s.	d.
Oct. 31.	By £849. 9s. 9d. 2¾ % Consols and Brokerage	855	5	3
	,, Deposit Account at London and South Western Bank .	58	9	4
	,, Interest accrued on Deposit Account	2	5	5
		£916	0	0

	£	s.	d.
Alexander Medal Trust Fund			

1902.		£	s.	d.
Oct. 31.	By Russian 4 % Bonds deposited at the London and South Western Bank	98	17	6

R. DUPPA LLOYD
I. FOSTER PALMER } *Auditors for the Fellows.*

WILLIAM J. CORBETT, *Auditor for the Council.*

INFORMATION RESPECTING THE SOCIETY
CHARTER OF INCORPORATION
BY-LAWS
LIST OF FELLOWS
AND SUBSCRIBING LIBRARIES
LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

AND

CATALOGUE OF FOREIGN TRANSACTIONS AND PERIODICALS IN THE LIBRARY OF THE SOCIETY

INFORMATION RESPECTING THE SOCIETY

Royal Historical Society.

(INCORPORATED BY ROYAL CHARTER.)

PATRON:
HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

PRESIDENT:
G. W. PROTHERO, Esq., Litt.D., LL.D.

I. The Historical Society was founded in the year 1868, by the then Archbishop of York, the late Earl Russell, the late George Grote, the late Dean of Westminster, Sir John Lubbock, Bart. (now Lord Avebury), the late Earl of Selborne (then Sir Roundell Palmer), and other eminent men of the day, its main objects being to promote and foster the study of History, by assisting in the publication of rare and valuable documents, and by the publication from time to time of volumes of Transactions and Publications.

II. In the year 1872 the Society, through the Secretary of State (the late Right Hon. H. A. Bruce, afterwards Lord Aberdare, G.C.B., for many years President of the Society), received the official permission of Her late Majesty Queen Victoria to adopt the title Royal Historical Society. In the year 1887 Her late Majesty was pleased to become Patron of the Society, and was also pleased to cause Letters Patent, dated July 31, 1889, to be passed under the Great Seal, granting to the Society Her Majesty's Royal Charter of Incorporation. Upon His accession to the Throne His Gracious Majesty King Edward VII. was pleased to become Patron of the

Society in succession to Queen Victoria. On May 2, 1897, the Camden Society was amalgamated with the Royal Historical Society, and the Camden Series of Publications was transferred to the latter Society.

III. The Society consists of a President, Fellows, and Honorary Fellows and Corresponding Members, forming together a body, at the present time, of nearly seven hundred Members. The principal States of Europe and America, British India, and the Colonies are represented by Honorary or Corresponding Fellows.

IV. The Annual Subscription to the Society is *Two Guineas;* and at present there is no entrance fee. Fellows may, on joining the Society, or afterwards, compound for all future subscriptions upon the payment of *Twenty Guineas.* Libraries may be admitted to the Membership of the Society for the purpose of receiving its publications on payment of an annual subscription of *One Pound.*

V. The Fellows of the Society and Subscribing Libraries in Great Britain receive gratuitously a copy of each of the Society's Transactions and Publications during the period of their subscription. It is desirable that Foreign Libraries should appoint an Agent in London to whom the Publications may be delivered for transmission.

The annual Publications of the Society include a volume of Transactions containing selected Papers read at the Society's Ordinary Meetings, together with the texts of the most valuable of the original documents which may be communicated to the Society from time

to time by historical scholars. In addition to this volume, the Council will endeavour to continue the regular production of a uniform series of Publications (in the style of the Camden Series of Publications), at the rate, if possible, of two volumes in every year. In the interests of the Membership of the Society, the Council have recently decided that the Publications of the Society shall in future be published by the Society alone, and shall be issued only to Fellows and Subscribing Libraries. Arrangements have been made by which back volumes, as far as the stock permits, can be supplied to newly-elected Fellows at a moderate price.

VI. Ordinary Meetings of the Society for the reading of Papers and discussions thereon are held from November to June, on the *third* Thursday in each month, at 5 P.M. The Anniversary Meeting is held on the third Thursday in February, when the Report of the Council is presented to the Fellows, and the President delivers his Annual Address.

VII. The Library of the Society, at 3 Old Serjeants' Inn, Chancery Lane, W.C., is open to Fellows daily, from 2 to 6 P.M. (Saturdays, 10 A.M. to 2 P.M.) The Library will be closed between August 15 and September 15, during Christmas week, during Easter week (for cleaning purposes), on Whit Monday and Whit Tuesday, and on His Majesty's Birthday and Coronation Day.

Books may be taken out by Fellows on signing a ticket for the same, but no Books may be kept out for a longer period than one month. Maps, MSS. and Periodicals must not be taken from the Library. Fellows are responsible for Books used or taken away

by them. No writing of any kind may be made upon Books or MSS. Owing to the limited space available for general historical literature, the Council must reserve the right to decline donations of books which may appear unsuitable.

VIII. All literary communications, proposals for Papers to be read before the Society, or for Historical documents or relics to be exhibited at the ordinary Meetings, should be addressed to the Director,

3 Old Serjeants' Inn, Chancery Lane, W.C.

All communications respecting the Library should be addressed to the Librarian,

3 Old Serjeants' Inn, Chancery Lane, W.C.

All subscriptions, unless paid by Banker's Order, should be sent to the Treasurer,

3 Old Serjeants' Inn,
Chancery Lane, W.C.

The attention of Fellows is directed to By-law XI. on this subject.

Communications on all other subjects should be addressed to the Hon. Secretary,

3 Old Serjeants' Inn, Chancery Lane, W.C.

No. I.

FORM OF A CANDIDATE'S CERTIFICATE.

Certificate of Candidate for Election.

Name,.....

Title, Profession, or Occupation,.....

Residence,.....

Qualifications,.....

being desirous of admission into the ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY, we the undersigned recommend him as a fit and proper person to be admitted as a Fellow.

Dated this.....day of.....190.....

.....*F.R. Hist. Soc.* { *From personal knowledge.*

.....*F.R. Hist. Soc.* { *From general knowledge (one signature required by Rule II.)*

.....*F.R. Hist. Soc.*

Proposed.....190.....

Elected.....190.....

Copies of this Form may be obtained on application to THE HON. SECRETARY, 3 *Old Serjeants' Inn, Chancery Lane, W.C.*

No. II.

A VOTE by ballot, when necessary, shall be conducted in the usual manner, and the Secretary shall cause Voting Papers to be prepared for that purpose in the following form :—

VOTING PAPER.

Election held ..... **19**.....

Candidates for the office of President:	1.	.....
	2.	.....
Vice-President:	**Retiring Vice-Presidents who offer themselves for re-election.**	
	1.	.....
	2.	.....
	Candidates nominated under Rule XVIII.	
	3.	.....
	4.	.....
For the Council:	**Retiring Members who offer themselves for re-election:**	
	1.	.....
	2.	.....
	3.	.....
	4.	.....
	Candidates nominated under Rule XVIII.	
	5	.....
	6	.....
	7.	.....
	8.	.....

Fellows shall record their votes by putting a cross against the names of the Candidates in whose favour they wish to vote. If any Fellow shall record his vote for more Candidates than there are vacancies, his Voting Paper shall be void.

CHARTER OF INCORPORATION

CHARTER OF INCORPORATION

OF THE

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Victoria, BY THE GRACE OF GOD, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith, TO ALL TO WHOM these Presents shall come, Greeting;

WHEREAS Our right trusty and well beloved Councillor, Henry Austin, Baron Aberdare, Knight Grand Cross of Our most Honourable Order of the Bath, Fellow of the Royal Society, has by his Petition humbly represented unto Us, That in the year one thousand eight hundred and sixty-eight, His Grace the Archbishop of York, the late Right Honourable John, Earl Russell, K.G., F.R.S., the late Very Reverend the Dean of Westminster, Sir John Lubbock, Baronet, the late Sir John Bowring, LL.D., Sir Roundell Palmer, Q.C., M.P., D.C.L., now Earl of Selborne, the late George Grote, Esquire, F.R.S., and others of Our subjects formed themselves into a Society known as the Historical Society of Great Britain, having for its object the promotion of the study of History;

AND WHEREAS We were pleased in the year one thousand eight hundred and seventy-two to permit the said Society to adopt the name and title of the Royal Historical Society;

AND WHEREAS in the year one thousand eight hundred and eighty-seven We were pleased to become Patron of the said Royal Historical Society;

AND WHEREAS it has been represented to Us by the said Petitioner that the said Society has been and continues to be actively employed in promoting the object for which the said Society was founded, and has published thirteen volumes of Transactions containing original memoirs read before the Society, and did also in the year one thousand eight hundred and eighty-six appoint a Com-

mittee for the due celebration of the eight hundredth anniversary of the completion of the Domesday Book of His late Majesty William the First, by which Committee meetings for the reading of papers and exhibitions of Domesday Book and other manuscripts were held, and the papers read at the meetings have been published under the title of Domesday Studies, of which We have been pleased to accept the dedication, and the said Society has also published the despatches from Paris in one thousand eight hundred and two–one thousand eight hundred and three of Lord Whitworth, Ambassador of His late Majesty King George III ;

AND WHEREAS the said Society has in aid of its objects collected a Library to which additions are constantly being made, and other property ;

AND WHEREAS the said Petitioner, believing that the well-being and usefulness of the said Society would be materially promoted by its obtaining a Charter of Incorporation, hath therefore, on behalf of himself and the other Fellows of the said Society, most humbly prayed that We would be pleased to grant to those who now are, or who shall from time to time become Fellows of the said Society, Our Royal Charter of Incorporation ;

NOW KNOW YE that We, being desirous of encouraging a design so laudable and salutary, of Our especial grace, certain knowledge and mere motion, have granted, directed and declared, and by these Presents do grant, direct, and declare that the said Henry Austin, Baron Aberdare, and such others of Our loving subjects as now are Fellows of the said Royal Historical Society (hereinafter called the said Society), or as shall hereafter from time to time become under the provisions of these Presents Members of the Body Politic and Corporate by these Presents created, shall for ever hereafter be one Body Politic and Corporate by the name of the ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY ; and for the purposes aforesaid, and by the name aforesaid, shall have perpetual succession and a Common Seal, with full power and authority to alter or vary, break and renew the same at their discretion, and by the same name to sue and be sued, implead and be impleaded, answer and be answered in every Court of Us, Our Heirs and Successors.

AND Our will and pleasure is, that the Royal Historical Society hereby created (hereinafter called the Corporation) may, notwithstanding the Statutes of Mortmain, take, purchase, hold and enjoy

to them and their successors a hall or house, and such other lands, tenements, and hereditaments as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes of the Society, Provided that the yearly value of such lands, tenements, and hereditaments (including the said hall or house) computed at the yearly value of the same at the time of the respective purchases or acquisition thereof do not exceed in the whole the sum of Two thousand pounds sterling.

AND Our will and pleasure is, and We do hereby declare, That there shall always be a Council of the Corporation, and that the said Council shall consist of a President, not less than six Vice-Presidents, a Treasurer, a Secretary, and not less than fourteen Councillors, who shall be elected and retire in accordance with the By-laws for the time being of the Corporation, and that the present Council of the said Society shall be the first Council of the Corporation;

AND Our will and pleasure is, That the Council of the Corporation may from time to time make, revoke, alter, and amend by-laws for all or any of the following purposes, to wit:—

(*a*) Prescribing the manner in which persons may become members of the Corporation and the conditions of membership, and the rights, powers, duties, privileges, and amotion of the members of the Corporation;

(*b*) Prescribing the tenure of office by the President, Vice-Presidents, Treasurer, Secretary, and Councillors of the Corporation (including those hereby appointed), and the mode of electing or appointing future Presidents, Vice-Presidents, Treasurers, Secretaries and Councillors, and the rights, powers, duties, privileges, and amotion of the first and future Presidents, Vice-Presidents, Treasurers, Secretaries, and Councillors;

(*c*) With respect to the appointments, emoluments, and tenure of office of the officers and servants of the Corporation;

(*d*) The election or appointment and amotion of honorary members or Fellows of the Corporation (who may, if the by-laws so declare, be either Our subjects or foreigners, or both);

(*e*) The classes into which Members are to be admitted;

(*f*) Generally for regulating the affairs, property, business, and interests of the Corporation and its Council and Members, and making, revoking, altering, and amending by-laws and carrying out the objects of these Presents;

Provided that such by-laws shall not be valid unless and until they have been approved by a clear majority of the members of the Corporation present at a meeting specially summoned for the purpose, and Provided also that if any by-law be contrary to the objects of the Corporation, or the intent or meaning of this Our Charter, or the laws or statutes of Our Realm, the same shall be absolutely null and void.

WE do further direct and declare that the existing by-laws of the said Society shall (so far as they are applicable) apply to the Corporation, its Council, members, and affairs until by-laws made under these Presents have come into force but no longer.

WE do further by these Presents declare that it is Our will and pleasure that these Presents may be repealed, altered, amended, or added to by any Charter granted by Us, Our Heirs and Successors, at any time hereafter, and accepted by a clear majority of the members of the Corporation present at a Meeting specially summoned for the purpose.

IN WITNESS whereof We have caused these Our Letters to be made Patent. WITNESS Ourself at Westminster, the thirtieth day of July, in the fifty-third year of Our Reign.

By Warrant under the Queen's Sign Manual,

MUIR MACKENZIE. L.S.

BY-LAWS

THE BY-LAWS

OF THE

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

(Incorporated by Royal Charter).

I.—The Society shall consist of Ordinary and Honorary Fellows and Corresponding Members. The number of Honorary Fellows shall not exceed Seventy-five ; and of these not more than twenty-five shall be British subjects.

II.—Every person desirous of admission into the Society as an Ordinary Fellow must be proposed and recommended agreeably to the Form No. I. in the Appendix hereto, and such recommendation must be subscribed by two Fellows at least, one of whom must certify his personal knowledge of such candidate. The certificate thus filled up shall be delivered to the Secretary, and shall be communicated by him to the Council at their next meeting, when the election of such candidate may take place.

III.—Fellows shall be elected by the Council on the vote of two-thirds of the Members of Council present. The names of those so elected shall be announced at the next Ordinary Meeting of Fellows.

IV.—The Secretary shall send to every elected Fellow notice of his election within seven days thereafter. No election of an Ordinary Fellow shall be complete, nor shall his name be

printed in the list of the Society, nor shall he be entitled to any of the privileges of a Fellow, until he shall have paid his entrance fee (if any) and first year's subscription, or compounded for the same, as hereinafter provided; and unless these payments be made within three calendar months from the date of election, such election may be declared void by the Council.

V.—Subject to the limit fixed in Rule I., the Council shall be empowered to elect persons of distinction in historical studies as Honorary Fellows, or as Corresponding Members, who shall not be required to pay an entrance fee or annual subscription; but no persons so elected shall be entitled, except on the special vote of the Council, to receive the Publications of the Society, or to vote at meetings. The Council may also nominate distinguished Fellows of the Society to be Honorary Vice Presidents, who shall be elected by the Fellows at the Anniversary Meeting, and shall retain the title so long as they are Fellows of the Society, provided that the number of Honorary Vice-Presidents shall not exceed twenty-five.

VI.—The Council shall also be empowered to admit Libraries as subscribers for the Publications of the Society, and to define from time to time the conditions of such admission.

VII.—If any Fellow of the Society shall so demean himself that it would be for the dishonour of the Society that he longer continue to be a Fellow thereof, the Council shall take the matter into consideration; and if two-thirds of the Members of the Council present and voting at a meeting (of which and of the matter in hand such Fellow and every Member of the Council shall have due notice) shall decide by ballot to recommend that such Fellow be removed from the Society, he shall be requested to resign. If he refuse to resign, a Special Meeting of the Society shall be convened to consider the recommendation of the Council, at which meeting, or at an adjourned meeting, the question shall be decided by ballot; and if two-thirds of the Fellows present and voting agree with the recommendation of the Council the name of such Fellow shall forthwith be removed from the Roll.

VIII.—The Annual Subscription shall be Two Guineas, provided always that Fellows elected prior to the 1st of March, 1884,

shall not be required to pay more than One Guinea annually, and Members of the Camden Society elected prior to the 1st March, 1895, the sum of One Pound annually. The Council shall decide from time to time whether any entrance fee shall be levied and, if so, shall fix its amount.

IX.—Fellows of the Society may at any time compound for their annual subscription by the single payment of Twenty Guineas, of which Fourteen Pounds Sterling shall be placed to the Capital Account of the Society.

X.—No Fellow shall be entitled to any of the privileges of the Society unless and until his subscriptions for the current and previous years have been paid.

XI.—Any Fellow of the Society failing to pay the subscription due for the current year on or before June 1, shall be applied to in writing by the Secretary; and if the same be not paid on or before the 31st December following, the Council shall be empowered to remove his name from the Roll; but such Fellows shall continue liable to the Society for the arrears of their subscriptions.

XII.—Every Ordinary Fellow of the Society shall, during the term of his subscription, be entitled to receive the Publications of the Society free of expense.

XIII.—Every Fellow of the Society shall furnish his Address, or that of his Agent or Banker, to the Secretary; and all notices or packets posted or sent to such address shall be held to be duly delivered.

XIV.—Fellows shall have access to the Society's Library under such regulations as may appear to the Council necessary.

XV.—The President shall be elected by the Fellows at the Anniversary Meeting, and shall hold office for a term of four years. The past Presidents shall be ex-officio Honorary Vice-Presidents of the Society.

XVI.—The Council shall consist of the President, not less than eight Vice-Presidents, the Treasurer, the Secretary, and not less than sixteen Councillors.

XVII.—The two Vice-Presidents senior on the Council Roll, and the four Councillors senior on the Council Roll, shall retire annually, but shall be re-eligible.

XVIII.—The names of Fellows to be submitted for election as Office-Bearers and Councillors shall be proposed by the Council and intimated to the Fellows at least Fifteen days before the Anniversary Meeting; but any ten Fellows of the Society may nominate Fellows to supply vacancies, such names being notified to the Secretary at least Ten days before the said Meeting. If the number of Candidates nominated as Vice-Presidents or Councillors be such as would, if all were elected, raise the number of Vice-Presidents or Councillors above eight or sixteen respectively, the Meeting shall determine the number of vacancies to be filled; and if the number of vacancies so determined for either class should be less than the number of Candidates, the elections for that class shall take place by ballot as provided in Appendix II.

XIX.—On a vacancy occurring in the office of President or other office of the Society, or in the Council, the Council shall have power to supply such vacancy until the following Anniversary Meeting.

XX.—In all Meetings of the Council five shall be a quorum, and all questions shall be decided by show of hands, unless a ballot be demanded.

XXI.—The Council shall determine the Works, Articles, and Papers to be read at the Society's Meetings, and otherwise shall arrange the business of the Society; and nothing shall be published in the name of the Society, or under its auspices, or inserted in the Society's *Transactions* or other publications, without the authority of the Council.

XXII.—The Council shall appoint any persons they deem fit to be salaried officers or clerks, for carrying on the necessary

concerns of the Society ; and shall define the duties to be performed by them respectively, and shall allow to them respectively such salaries, gratuities, and privileges as the Council may deem proper ; and may suspend or discharge any officer or clerk from office whenever there shall seem to them occasion for so doing.

XXIII.—The Meetings of the Society are of three kinds—Anniversary, Special, and Ordinary.

XXIV.—The Anniversary Meeting shall be held on the Third Thursday of February, or at such other time as the Council shall from time to time appoint. At the Anniversary Meeting the vacancies in the Council shall be filled up.

XXV.—The Council may call a Special Meeting of the Society whenever it shall be considered necessary, and shall convene a Special Meeting of the Society on a requisition to that effect being made by twenty Fellows, the date of such Meeting being fixed within one month from the receipt of the requisition.

XXVI.—A fortnight's notice, at least, of the time when, and the object for which, every Special Meeting is to be holden shall be sent to every Fellow residing in the United Kingdom ; and no other business than that of which notice has been thus given shall be entered upon or discussed at such Meeting.

XXVII.—At every Special Meeting of the Society ten Fellows shall form a quorum.

XXVIII.—The Ordinary Meetings shall be held on the third Thursday of each month, from November to June inclusive in each year, or at such other times as the Council shall determine.

XXIX.—At the Ordinary Meetings papers and communications shall be read and discussed ; but nothing relating to the regulations or management of the Society shall be brought forward.

XXX.—Visitors to the Ordinary Meetings may be admitted, if introduced personally by Fellows, or by their written order, under such regulations as the Council may determine.

XXXI.—Any Fellow of the Society who proposes to read a Paper at any Ordinary Meeting shall submit it for the approval of the Council, and shall state in writing whether such Paper has, in whole or in part, been previously read to any other Society, or publicly utilised in any form ; but it shall rest with the Council to determine whether a Paper shall be read or utilised by the Society.

XXXII.—At all Meetings of the Society, or the Council, or the Committees thereof, the President, if present, shall be Chairman ; and in his absence one of the Vice-Presidents, or, if no Vice-President be present, a Member of Council shall be elected Chairman for the occasion.

XXXIII.—In all Meetings of the Society and Council, except in the cases otherwise provided for, the decision of a majority of the Fellows voting shall be considered as the decision of the Meeting, the President or Chairman having a casting vote only.

XXXIV.—The Accounts of the Society shall be from time to time examined by the Council, who shall present, and cause to be read to the Anniversary Meeting a complete statement thereof, together with a report on the general affairs of the Society during the preceding year.

XXXV.—The Treasurer shall receive all moneys due to the Society, and on the order of the Council pay out of the moneys so received all charges on the Society's funds ; he shall keep a proper account of his receipts and payments. All cheques or orders on the Treasurer's account for the payment of any sum of money above £5 must be authorised by the Council, and cheques must be signed by the Treasurer and two Members of the Council.

XXXVI.—At the last Ordinary Meeting in each session, the Fellows shall choose two Auditors, not of the Council, who, with one Auditor appointed by the Council, shall audit the Treasurer's accounts, and report thereon to the Society, which report shall be presented to the Anniversary Meeting.

Royal Historical Society.

(INCORPORATED BY ROYAL CHARTER.)

OFFICERS AND COUNCIL—1902-1903.

Patron.

HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

President.

G. W. PROTHERO, Litt.D., LL.D.

Honorary Vice-Presidents.

THE RIGHT HON. LORD AVEBURY, D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S.
THE REV. J. F. BRIGHT, D.D., Master of University College, Oxford.
THE RIGHT HON. SIR MOUNTSTUART E. GRANT DUFF, G.C.S.I., D.L., F.R.S.
SIR JOHN EVANS, K.C.B., D.C.L., Sc.D., LL.D.
LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE, M.A., M.P.
THOMAS HODGKIN, D.C.L., F.S.A.
SIR R. C. JEBB, D.C.L., Litt.D., LL.D., M.P.
PROFESSOR F. W. MAITLAND, LL.D., D.C.L.
THE RIGHT HON. JOHN MORLEY, O.M., D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S., M.P.
THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF ROSEBERY, K.T., K.G., D.C.L., LL.D.
FREDERICK SEEBOHM, LL.D., F.S.A.
SIR LESLIE STEPHEN, Litt.D.
A. W. WARD, Litt.D., LL.D., Master of Peterhouse, Cambridge.

Vice-Presidents.

OSCAR BROWNING, M.A.
JAMES GAIRDNER, C.B., LL.D.
THE RIGHT REV. F. A. GASQUET, D.D.
FREDERIC HARRISON, M.A.
REV. WILLIAM HUNT, D.Litt.
H. E. MALDEN, M.A.
PROFESSOR H. F. PELHAM, M.A., President of Trinity College, Oxford.

Council.

C. Raymond Beazley, M.A., F.R.G.S.
Rev. Professor W. E. Collins, B.D.
William J. Corbett, M.A.
Rev. W. Cunningham, D.D., LL.D.
Rev. J. Silvester Davies, M.A., F.S.A.
C. H. Firth, LL.D.
F. Haverfield, M.A., F.S.A.
I. S. Leadam, M.A.
Sidney Lee, Litt.D.
Colonel E. M. Lloyd, R.E.
Professor C. W. C. Oman, M.A., F.S.A.
Sir F. Pollock, Bt., D.C.L., LL.D.
Sir J. H. Ramsay, Bt., M.A.
T. Seccombe, M.A.
W. H. Stevenson, M.A.
The Ven. Archdeacon Robinson Thornton, D.D.

Honorary Secretary.

H. E. Malden, M.A.

Director.

Hubert Hall, F.S.A., 3 Old Serjeants' Inn, Chancery Lane, W.C.

Treasurer.

R. Hovenden, F.S.A.

Auditors.

W. J. Corbett, M.A. J. Foster Palmer. R. Duppa Lloyd.

Assistant Secretary and Librarian.

Miss M. B. Curran.

Library and Offices.

3 Old Serjeants' Inn, Chancery Lane, W.C.

Royal Historical Society.

STANDING COMMITTEES—1902-1903.

Finance Committee.

C. R. Beazley, M.A., F.R.G.S.
Rev. J. Silvester Davies, M.A., F.S.A.
The Right Rev. F. A. Gasquet, D.D.
Frederic Harrison, M.A.
Rev. William Hunt, D.Litt.
I. S. Leadam, M.A.
Hubert Hall, F.S.A., *Director.*
R. Hovenden, F.S.A., *Treasurer.*
H. E. Malden, M.A., *Hon. Sec.*

Library Committee.

C. R. Beazley, M.A., F.R.G.S.
Rev. Professor W. E. Collins, B.D.
Rev. J. Silvester Davies, M.A., F.S.A.
The Right Rev. F. A. Gasquet, D.D.
Colonel E. M. Lloyd, R.E.
Hubert Hall, F.S.A., *Director.*
R. Hovenden, F.S.A., *Treasurer.*
H. E. Malden, M.A., *Hon. Sec.*

Publication Committee.

C. R. Beazley, M.A., F.R.G.S.
Oscar Browning, M.A.
C. H. Firth, LL.D.
James Gairdner, C.B., LL.D.
The Right Rev. F. A. Gasquet, D.D.
Frederic Harrison, M.A.
Rev. William Hunt, D.Litt.
I. S. Leadam, M.A.
Sidney Lee, Litt.D.
W. H. Stevenson, M.A.
Hubert Hall, F.S.A., *Director.*
R. Hovenden, F.S.A., *Treasurer.*
H. E. Malden, M.A., *Hon. Sec.*

LIST OF FELLOWS

OF THE

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Names of Officers and Members of Council are printed in SMALL CAPITALS.
*Those marked * have compounded for their Annual Subscriptions.*

Abbot, Richard, Forcett, near Darlington.
*Ackers, B. St. John, Huntley Manor, Gloucester.
Adshead, G. H., Fern Villas, 100 Bolton Road, Pendleton, Manchester.
Aiya, V. Nagam, B.A., Tirumalai Lodge, Trivandrum, Travancore, S. India.
Aldenham, Lord, St. Dunstan's Villa, Outer Circle, Regent's Park, N.W.
* Alexander, L. C., Holly Lodge, Upper Park Field, Putney.
Allen, Rev. G. C., M.A., Cranleigh School, Surrey.
* Amherst, The Right Hon. Earl, Montreal, Sevenoaks, Kent.
Anderson, John H., 5 Lexham Gardens, S.W.
Anthony, Charles.
Armstrong, Edward, M.A., Queen's College, Oxford.
Arnold, Arthur Claude, M.A., Hermitage House, Newbury.
* Ashcombe, Lord, 123 St. George's Square, Pimlico, S.W.
Ashley, Percy, M.A., The Settlement, Tavistock Place, W.C.
Astley, Rev. H. J. Dukinfield, M.A., F.R.S.L., East Rudham Vicarage, King's Lynn.
Atkinson, C. T., M.A., Exeter College, Oxford.
*Auden, Miss Henrietta M., Condover Vicarage, Shrewsbury.
AVEBURY, The Right Hon. Lord, D.C.L., F.R.S., F.L.S., 2 St. James's Square, S.W.

Backhouse, Jonathan E., Bank, Darlington.
Baer, S. L., Hochstrasse, 6 Frankfort-on-Main.
* Baguley, Henry, 6 Park Road, Wandsworth, S.W.
Baker, James, Sewelle Villa, Clifton, Bristol.
Ballinger, John, Librarian, Public Libraries, Cardiff.
Banks, M. L., M.A., The Redlands, Tiverton, N. Devon.
Bannerman, W. Bruce, F.S.A., F S.A. Scot., The Lindens, Sydenham Road, Croydon.

* Barnard, John.
Barnard, F. P., M.A., F.S.A., F.S.A. Scot., Bilsby House, near Alford, Lincolnshire.
* Barrett, T. Squire, M.A.I., F.Z.S., F.S.S., F.R.B.S., 18 Millfield Road, Appleton-in-Widnes.
Bartlett, Franklin, 82 Times Buildings, New York.
Bates, Octavius I.
Bateson, Miss Mary, 9 Huntingdon Road, Cambridge.
Baxter, Wynne E., F.R.G.S., 170 Church Street, Stoke Newington.
Beauchamp, Henry K., *Madras Mail* Office, Madras.
Beazley, Charles Raymond, M.A., F.R.G.S., Merton College, Oxford, and 21 Staverton Road, Oxford.
Benson, Arthur Christopher, M.A., The Old Granary, Cambridge.
* Bevington, Colonel S. R., Neckinger Mills, Bermondsey, S.E.
Billing, Rev. F. A., D.D., LL.D., F.R.S.L., 7 St. Donatt's Road, New Cross, S.E.
Bindon, E. R. R.
Bird, Rev. A. F. Ryder, Forest Hill House, Honor Oak, S.E.
Bladen, Frank M., "Murcott," Mosman Bay, N. S. Wales.
Bowman, J. N., M.A., Ph.D., Whatcom, Washington, U.S.A.
Boynton, Thomas, Norman House, Bridlington Quay, Yorks.
*Brackenridge, George Washington, San Antonia, Texas, U.S.A.
Braikenridge, William Jerdone, 16 Royal Crescent, Bath.
Bright, Rev. James Franck, D.D., Master of University College, Oxford.
Briscoe, John Potter, F.R.S.L., F.S.A., Public Libraries, Nottingham.
Britten, Col. John, 106 Cambridge Gardens, North Kensington, W.
* Brocklehurst, Septimus, F.R.G.S., Olinda, Aigburth Drive, Sefton Park, Liverpool.
Brough, William S., Fowlchurch, Leek, Staffordshire.
Brown, Colonel Henry Thomas, Roodeye House, Chester.
Browne, Rev. William H., St. Genny's Vicarage, Bude, R.S.O., North Cornwall.
Browne, Harold E. G., 15 Kingsgate Street, Winchester.
Browning, Oscar, M.A., King's College, Cambridge.
Buchanan, William Frederick, F.R.G.S., Union Club, Sydney, New South Wales.
Burd, L. A., M.A., Repton School, near Burton-on-Trent.
* Burdett-Coutts, The Baroness, 1 Stratton Street, W.
* Butt, Arthur N., London Institution, Finsbury Circus, E.C.

Cairns, Rev. J. Arthur R., B.A., St. James's Manse, Alnwick.
Camidge, William, 36 Monkgate, York.
* Carillon, J. Wilson, F.S.A., The Chimes, Richmond, Surrey.
* Carington, H. H. Smith, Grangethorpe, Rusholme.
Carlyle, E. I., M.A., Merton College, Oxford.
Carnell, George Frederick, Sevenoaks.
* Chance, James Frederick, M.A., 30 Lennox Gardens, S.W.
* Chancellor, E. Beresford, M.A., F.R.H.S., 29 Elm Park Gardens, S.W.
Chapman, J. J., M.A., 17 St. Hilda's Terrace, Whitby.
Cheney, A. D., Lympne, Hythe, Kent.
* Chase, George B.
Childs, Horatio, St. Martin's Northern Schools, Castle Street, Long Acre, W.C.
Chorlton, Thomas, 32 Brazenose Street, Manchester.
* Church, George Earl, F.R.G.S., 216 Cromwell Road, S. Kensington.

Clapham, J. H., M.A., 13 Beechgrove Terrace, Leeds.
Coate, James, Lea Coombe House, Axminster, Devon.
Cobb, Cyril Stephen, B.C.L., M.A., F.R.G.S., 1 Dr. Johnson's Buildings, Temple, E.C.
Cockle, Capt. M. J. D., R.E., The Cottage, Solan, Punjab, India.
Coleman, Everard Home, F.R.A.S., F.R.G.S., 71 Brecknock Road, N.
Collins, Rev. Prof. W. E., B.D.
* Corbett, William J., M.A., King's College, Cambridge.
Corns, A. R., Public Library, Lincoln.
Cotgreave, Alfred, Public Library, Stratford, E.
Courtauld, George, Cut Hedge, near Halstead, Essex.
Cowell, Peter, Free Public Library, Liverpool.
Cozens-Smith, E., F.S.S., 5 Longridge Road, South Kensington.
Crake, Rev. Edward E., Jevington Rectory, Polegate, Sussex.
* Crawford, J. W., East Street Mills, Leeds.
Crawford, the Right Hon. the Earl of, F.R.S., Haigh Hall, Wigan.
Crawley, William John Chetwode, LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.G.S., F.G.S., 3 and 4 Ely Place, Dublin.
* Crofton, Henry M., F.R.A.S., M.R.I.A., Inchmappa, Ashford, county Wicklow.
Crump, Mrs. Lucy, 1 The Wilderness, Holly Hill, Hampstead.
* Cunningham, Rev. W., D.D., LL.D., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Curzon, Frank, 35 Hanover Square, Leeds.

Dalton, Thomas M., Darrington, Camberley, Surrey.
Dames, R. S. Longworth, 21 Herbert Street, Dublin.
* Davids, Professor T. W. Rhys, LL.D., 21 Honor Oak Road, S.E.
Davies, Francis Robert, Hawthorn, Blackrock, Dublin.
Davies, Rev. J. Silvester, M.A., F.S.A., Adelaide House, Forty Hill, Enfield.
Davies (*see* Wyatt-Davies).
Dawson, Rev. W., M.A., Susancourt, Loughton, Essex.
* Dees, Robert Richardson, The Hall, Wallsend, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Denham, Edward, 384 Acushnet Avenue, New Bedford, Mass., U.S.A.
Derby, The Right Hon. the Earl of, 33 St. James's Square, S.W.
De Vaynes, Miss J. A. L., Updown, near Margate.
Dilke, Right Hon. Sir C. W., Bt., M.P., 76 Sloane Street, S.W.
* Dimelow, John Gartside, Landsmere, Palatine Road, Didsbury.
Ditchburn, G. Hartley, The Cathedral, Manchester.
Ditchfield, Rev. P. H., M.A., Barkham Rectory, Wokingham, Berks.
Doble, C. E., 21 Winchester Road, Oxford.
Doncaster, J. H., Birchfield, Abbeydale, Sheffield.
Doyle, John A., Pendarren, Crickhowell.
Doughty, Arthur G., M.A., Bibliothèque de la Législature, Quebec, Canada.
Dowding, W. L., 13 Kingsley Road, Cotham, Bristol.
Drummond, Major Francis Henry Rutherford, c/o Messrs. H. S. King & Co., 45 Pall Mall, S.W.

Eady, Amos, 48 Dixon Street, Lincoln.
* Eayrs, Rev. George, 39 Ash Grove, Bradford.
Eckersley, James Carlton, M.A., F.R.G.S., F.S.S., Ashfield, Wigan, Lancashire.
Edmundson, Rev. George, M.A., Northolt Rectory, near Southall.
Edwards, Wm., M.A., 7 Spring Gardens, Bradford.

* Edwin-Cole, James, Swineshead Hall, near Boston, Lincolnshire.
Edwyn, Richard, 15 Helix Gardens, Brixton Hill, S.W.
* Elliot, John, Free Library, Wolverhampton.
Elsom, Henry, High School, Kirkby Stephen.
Emery, John A., Ty Hyfryd, Cinderford, Gloucestershire.
EVANS, Sir JOHN, K.C.B., D.C.L., F.R.S., F.S.A., Nash Mills, Hemel Hempstead.
* Evans, W., The Spring, Kenilworth, Warwickshire.
* Ezard, Dr. Edward Henry, 220 Lewisham High Road, S.E.

* Falkiner, C. Litton, Mount Mapas, Killiney, co. Dublin.
Felce, Ernest, 27 All Saints' Green, Norwich.
Fenwick, Miss Susan F., 29 Harley Street, W.
* Ferguson, Professor John, M.A., LL.D., University, Glasgow.
* Ferrers, The Right Hon. Earl, Staunton Harrold, Melbourne, Derby.
FIGGIS, Rev. J. NEVILLE, M.A., Marnhull Rectory, Blandford, Dorset.
* Finnemore, The Hon. Mr. Justice, Puisne Judge, Supreme Court, Pietermaritzburg, Natal, South Africa.
FIRTH, CHARLES HARDING, M.A., LL.D., 2 Northmoor Road, Oxford.
Firth, Solomon, 21 Upper Tichbourne Street, Leicester.
Fisher, H. A. L., M.A., 34 Norham Road, Oxford.
Fitch, Edwin F., 66 Bishopsgate Street, E.C.
Fitzgerald, Gerald Beresford, F.S.A., 63 Eaton Square, S.W.
* Fitzgerald, Major William George.
FITZMAURICE, Lord EDMOND GEORGE, M.P., Leigh House, Bradford-on-Avon, Wilts.
Fleming, Sandford, C.E., C.M.G., LL.D., Ottawa, Canada.
Fletcher, Banister F., A.R.I.B.A., 29 New Bridge Street, E.C.
* Fletcher, John S., Merle Wood, Virginia Water.
Fooks, William, M.A., LL.B., 2 Brick Court, Temple, E.C.
Forshaw, Charles F., LL.D., F.R.S.L., Baltimore House, 26 Hanover Square, Bradford.
Fowler, W. Warde, M.A., Lincoln College, Oxford.
Fox, Francis F., F.S.A., Yate House, Chipping Sodbury, Gloucestershire.
Fraser, A. B., Roddach Bow, Denton Road, Canton, Cardiff.
* Freake, Lady.
Free, Rev. Richard W., M.A., St. Cuthbert's Lodge, Millwall, E.
Freeman, J. J., 23 Abingdon Street, W.C.
Fulford, Frederick H., Connaught House, 9 West Park, Clifton, Bristol.
Fulford, Rev. John L. L., The School House, Atherstone, Warwickshire.
* Furnivall, Frederick J., M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt., 3 St. George's Square, Primrose Hill, N.W.

GAIRDNER, JAMES, C.B., LL.D., West View, Pinner, Middlesex.
Galton, Rev. Arthur, M.A., The Palace, Ripon.
Gardiner, F. J., Trevordale, Wisbech.
Gardner, Miss Alice, Newnham College, Cambridge.
Garrett, J. P., 38 Great James Street, Bedford Row, W.C.
* Garstin, John Ribton, M.A., F.S.A., M.R.I.A., Braganstown, Castle Bellingham, co. Louth.
GASQUET, The Right Rev. FRANCIS AIDAN, D.D., Principal of the Benedictine Order in England, 4 Great Ormond Street, W.C.
Geikie, R., M.A., 10 Chester Terrace, Regent's Park, N.W.
Gerring, Charles, Westdale Villas, Gedling, Nottingham.
Gill, John, Penryn, Cornwall.

Giuseppi, M. S., F.S.A., Public Record Office, Fetter Lane, E.C.
* Gooch, G. P., M.A., South Villa, Campden Hill Road, W.
* Gough, Henry, Sandcroft, Redhill, Surrey.
Gower, Lord Ronald, Hammerfield, Penshurst, Kent.
Graham, Miss Rose, 12 Ladbroke Gardens, Notting Hill, W.
Grant, Professor Arthur J., M.A., 22 Hyde Terrace, Leeds.
* GRANT DUFF, The Right Hon. Sir MOUNTSTUART ELPHINSTONE, G.C.S.I., F.R.S., 11 Chelsea Embankment, S.W.; and Lexden Park, Colchester.
Green, F. W., 470 Mayfield Villas, Merton Road, Southfields, S.W.
Green, Mrs. J. R., 36 Grosvenor Road, Westminster, S.W.
* Green, T. J. Shipton, 15 Porchester Terrace, Hyde Park, W.
Green, Rev. Edward Dyer, M.A., Bromborough Rectory, Cheshire.
Green, Samuel S., Free Public Library, Worcester, Mass., U.S.A.
Green, W. D., M.P., Claremont, Wednesbury.
Guest, J. S. H., M.A., Upper Canada College, Toronto, Canada.

*‡Hailstone, Edward, 9 Rue de Tocqueville, Paris.
Hale, Surgeon-Major Thomas Egerton, B.A., M.D., V.C., Faddiley Lodge, near Nantwich, Cheshire.
Hales, Professor J. W., M.A., F.S.A., 1 Oppidans Road, Primrose Hill, N.W.
HALL, HUBERT, F.S.A., *Director*, 4 Elm Court, Temple, E.C.
Hall, H. F., Oaklands, Sheffield.
Hall, Hamilton, F.S.A., Fordcombe, Tunbridge Wells.
Harben, Sir Henry, Seaford Lodge, Fellows Road, N.W.
Hare, Sholto H.
Harris, James Howard, Porthleven, Helston, Cornwall.
* HARRISON, FREDERIC, M.A., Elm Hill, Hawkhurst, Kent.
* Harvey, William Marsh, Goldington Hall, Bedford.
Hassall, A., M.A., Christ Church, Oxford.
* HAVERFIELD, F., M.A., F.S.A., Christ Church, Oxford.
Hay, James A. C., C.E., M.R.S.G.S., 12 Copers Cope Road, Beckenham, Kent.
Headlam, J. W., M.A., King's College, Cambridge.
Healey, Edward Charles, Wyphurst, near Guildford.
Heaton, R. W., M.A., Government Library, Pretoria, S. Africa.
Heaton, Rev. W. J., 24 West Cliff Road, Whitstable.
Heaviside, Rev. George, B.A., F.R.G.S., 7 Grosvenor Street, Coventry.
Herries, The Right Hon. Lord, Everingham Park, York.
Hewitt, Charles R., 81 Whippendell Road, Watford, Herts.
Hewlett, Maurice, 7 Northwick Terrace, N.W.
Hill, Mrs. Mary, Leighton House, near Heston, Cheshire.
Hill, Rev. H. Ernest, Abbey School, Beckenham.
Hill, Rowland, Central Library, Blackpool.
Hill, Samuel Thomas, F.R.G.S., Stebonhethe, Northcote Road, St. Margaret's, Twickenham.
* Hinmers, William, Cleveland House, Eccles Old Road, Pendleton.
Hobson, Thomas, Blacker Hill, Barnsley, Yorks.
HODGKIN, THOMAS, D.C.L., F.S.A., Barmoor Castle, Beal, Northumberland.
Hodgson, Shadworth Hollway, 45 Conduit Street, W.
Holland, B. H., M.A., 32 Kensington Square, S.W.
Holmes, Emra, F.R.S.A.I., Hillfield, Oundle, Northants.
Hooper, George N., Elmleigh, Hayne Road, Beckenham, S.E.
Hornby, Rev. James John, D.D., F.R.G.S., Provost of Eton, Eton College, Windsor.
* Horniman, F. J., M.P., Surrey Mount, Forest Hill, S.E.
* Horrocks, J. W., Gill Terrace, Moston Lane, Blackley, Manchester.

* Hovenden, Frederick, Glenlea, Thurlow Park Road, West Dulwich, S.E.
Hovenden, Robert, F.S.A., *Hon. Treasurer*, Heathcote, Park Hill Road, Croydon.
Hughes, William E., 89 Alexandra Road, South Hampstead.
Humphery, George Richard, 16 St. Donatt's Road, New Cross, S.E.
Hunt, Rev. William, D.Litt., 24 Phillimore Gardens, Campden Hill, W.
Hurlbatt, Miss E., Bedford College, York Place, Baker Street, W.
Hutton, Rev. William Holden, B.D., St. John's College, Oxford.

Inderwick, F. A., K.C., F.S.A., 8 Warwick Square, S.W.

Jago-Trelawny, Major-General John, F.R.G.S., Coldrenick, Liskeard, Cornwall.
Jebb, Professor Sir R. C., Knt., Litt.D., D.C.L., LL.D., M.P., Springfield, Cambridge.
Jessopp, The Rev. Canon Augustus, D.D., F.S.A., Scarning Rectory, East Dereham, Norfolk.
Johnson, W. Guy, 324 Regent Street, W.
* Jones, Joseph, Abberley Hall, Stourport, Worcestershire.
Jones, Rev. E. Humphrey, The Rectory, Lydiard Tregoz, Swindon, Wilts.
Jones, Rev. Thomas, Ambleston Vicarage, Treffgarn R.S.O., Pembrokeshire.

His Highness Kerala Varma, C.S.I., Trivandrum, Travancore, India.
Kirkpatrick, Robert, 1 Queen Square, Strathbungo, Glasgow.
Kitto, John Vivian, Ripple Vale House, near Dover.
* Knaus, C. T., F.R.G.S., 51 Queen's Road, Bradford.
Kushal Pal Sinh, Rais of Kotla, Kotla, Agra, India.

de Lamarre, Louis Bert, Bridgetown, Barbados, B.W.I.
Langhorne, W. B., Hawkchurch Rectory, near Axminster.
Langley, Rev. A. S., 25 West Street, Newcastle, Staffs.
* Larkin, Matthew, J.P., F.R.G.S.
Lawson, Rev. John Sharpe, M.A., LL.D., St. George's Vicarage, Barnsley, Yorks.
Leadam, Isaac Saunders, M.A., Reform Club, S.W.
Leathes, Stanley, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Lee, Sidney, Litt.D., 108 Lexham Gardens, Kensington, W.
*Leonard, Miss E. M., 1 Lindfield Gardens, Hampstead, N.W.
Lewis, Rev. Thomas Curling, Dodbrooke Rectory, Kingsbridge, Devon.
* Liberty, Arthur Lasenby, F.R.S.S., F.Z.S., J.P., The Manor House, The Lee, near Great Missenden, Bucks.
Little, Andrew G., M.A., Oakleigh, Holly bush Lane, Sevenoaks.
Lloyd, Colonel E. M., R.E., Glenhurst, Brighton Road, Sutton.
* Lloyd, Rev. John, M.A.
Lloyd, J. A., The Studio, Marlborough, Wilts.
Lloyd, Richard Duppa, 2 Addison Crescent, Kensington, W.
* Lobb, John, F.R.G.S., Carlton House, Victoria Park Road, South Hackney.
Lockhart, Arthur W., Christ's Hospital, West Horsham.
* Lodge, Professor R., M.A., 25 Hope Terrace, Edinburgh.
Lord, Professor Walter Frewen, B.A., Durham College of Science, Newcastle, Oxford and Cambridge Club, Pall Mall, S.W.
Lucas, Frank W., Ferndale, Westcombe Park Road, Blackheath, S.E.

Luck, H. Courtenay, F.R.G.S., J.P., Norman Chambers, Creek Street, Brisbane, Queensland.
* Lydall, John French.
* Lyle, Thomas, M.A., Mornington Villa, 228 Amhurst Road, Hackney Downs, N.E.

* Macandrew, W., Westwood House, near Colchester.
* Mackeson, Edward, F.S.A.
Madeley, Rev. Walter, M.A., School House, Woodbridge.
Maguire, Thomas Miller, M.A., LL.D., Earl's Court Square, S.W.
MAITLAND, Professor F.W., M.A., LL.D., D.C.L., Downing College, Cambridge.
MALDEN, HENRY ELLIOT, M.A., *Hon. Sec.*, The Beacon, St. Catherine's, Guildford.
Marriott, W. K., Great Baddow, Essex.
* Marsden, R. G., M.A., 13 Leinster Gardens, Lancaster Gate, W.
Marsh, A. E. W., 16 Argyle Place, Edinburgh, N.B.
Marsh, Dr. G. W. B., B.A., 40 Tachbrook Street, S.W.
Mathews, E. R. N., Librarian, Public Libraries, Bristol.
Maurice, A., 23 Bedford Street, Strand, W.C.
Medley, Prof. D. J., M.A., 6 University Gardens, Glasgow.
Mercer, W. J., 12 Marine Terrace, Margate.
Merriam, C. P., 79 Highbury New Park, N.
Merriman, Roger B., M.A., Stoneyhurst, Intervale, New Hampshire, U.S.A.
* Metcalfe, Rev. James, M.A., Vicarage, West Teignmouth.
* Miggs, John Gilbert.
Miles, Colonel S. B., c/o Messrs. H. S. King & Co., 45 Pall Mall, S.W.
Milman, Rev. W. H., M.A., Sion College, Victoria Embankment, E.C.
Moloney, Sir Cornelius Alfred, K.C.M.G.
Money-Coutts, Francis Burdett, Walsingham House, Piccadilly.
Monson, G. J., Hindhead Chase, Grayshott, Surrey.
Moon, Zebedee, Librarian, Public Library, Leyton.
MORLEY, Rt. Hon. JOHN, M.P., Flowermead, Wimbledon Park, Surrey.
Morris, A., Gwynfa, Gold Tops, Newport, Mon.
Morrison, Hew, Librarian, Public Library, Edinburgh.
Munich, Charles Jean, The War Office, Cleveland House, St. James's Square, S.W.

Naylor, Robert Anderton, F.R.G.S., Cuerden Hall, Thelwall, Cheshire.
Newland, H. O., Rawdon, Rastell Avenue, Telford Park, S.W.
Nichols, John Bruce, Parliament Mansions, Victoria Street, S.W.
Nihjoff, Martinus, The Hague, c/o D. Nutt, Long Acre, W.C.
Northampton, The Most Honourable the Marquis of, K.G., 51 Lennox Gardens, S.W.
Northumberland, His Grace the Duke of, K.G., 2 Grosvenor Place, S.W.

OMAN, C. W. C., M.A., F.S.A., All Souls College, Oxford.
Ord, Clement, M.A., Athelney, All Saints' Road, Clifton, Bristol.
Osborn, John L., Elmcroft, Winterbourne Down, near Bristol.
Osborne, H. Claude, 36 Blandford Avenue, Beckenham, Kent.
Owen, Edward Humphrey, F.S.A., Ty Coch, Carnarvon.

PALMER, JAMES FOSTER, L.R.C.P., M.R.C.S.E., 8 Royal Avenue, Chelsea College, S.W.

Parker, Henry, C.E., 76 Station Road, South Shore, Blackpool.
Parker, John W., Heathside Schools, Warrington.
Parkin, Thomas, M.A., F.R.G.S., Fairseat, High Wickham, Hastings.
Parmelee, G. W., B.A., D.C.L., Department of Public Instruction, Quebec, Canada.
* Parr, J. Charlton, Grappenhall Heyes, Warrington.
Paterson, Arthur, 4 Pilgrim's Road, Hampstead.
Patterson, James K., Ph.D., President of the Agricultural College, Lexington, Kentucky, U.S.A.
Pedrick, J. Gale, 110 St. Martin's Lane, W.C.
PELHAM, Professor H. F., M.A., President of Trinity College, Oxford.
Pembroke, The Right Hon. the Earl of, F.R.G.S., Wilton House, Salisbury, Wilts.
Penny, Arthur Paul, 18 Bedford Place, W.C.
* Perry, Lieut.-Col. Ottley, J.P., F.R.G.S., F.S.A., Roxwell, Northwood, Middlesex.
* Peyster, General John Watts de, 59 East 21st Street, New York.
Pflugk-Harttung, Professor Dr. Julius von, 23 Spenerstrasse, Berlin, N.W.
Philip, George, 32 Fleet Street, E.C.
Pierce, Rev. F. Dormer, M.A., Wickford Rectory, Essex.
Pike, Rev. Clement E., Holmwood, Newport, Isle of Wight.
Pollard, A. F., M.A., 85 Erpingham Road, Putney.
POLLOCK, Sir F., Bt., LL.D., F.S.A., 13 Old Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
* Porges, Theodore, F.R.G.S., 17 Avenue Friedland, Paris.
Pratt, A. T. C., 46 Winterbrooke Road, Herne Hill, S.E.
PROTHERO, G. W., M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., *President*, 24 Bedford Square, Bloomsbury.
Prothero, R. E., M.A., 3 Cheyne Walk, Chelsea, S.W.
Pym, Guy, M.P., 35 Cranley Gardens, S.W.

Radford, J. T., Canterbury Villas, 23 Cranmer Street, Nottingham.
Radice, Mrs., Fernwood, Wimbledon Park.
RAMSAY, Sir JAMES HENRY, Bt., M.A., Banff, Alyth, N.B.
Rankin, J. R. Lea, 2 Sloane Court, S.W.
* Rashdall, Rev. H., New College, Oxford.
* Reddaway, William F., M.A., King's College, Cambridge.
Reichel, H. R., M.A., Principal, University College, Bangor.
Renshaw, Walter Charles, K.C., 5 Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn.
* Richards, H. C., K.C., M.P., 2 Mitre Court Buildings, Temple, E.C.
Ripon, The Most Hon. the Marquess of, K.G., D.C.L., F.R.S., 9 Chelsea Embankment, S.W.
* Robinson, Wilfrid C., 13, Wulfhage Street, Bruges, Belgium.
Ropes, Arthur Reed, M.A., F.R.S., 31 Addison Mansions, Kensington, W.
* Ropes, J. C., 99 Mount Vernon, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.
* ROSEBERY, The Right Hon. the Earl of, K.G., 38 Berkeley Square, W.
Ross, Lieut.-Col. Wm. G., Craigie, The Lees, Malvern.
Rumbold, The Right Hon. Sir Horace, Bart., G.C.B., 127 Sloane Street, S.W.
* Russell, Hon. Rollo, Dunrozel, Haslemere.
Rylands, Mrs., The John Rylands Library, Manchester.
Rymer, Samuel Lee, J.P., Pevensey, Wellesley Road, Croydon.

Sadler, Wilson D., M.A., 32 East Park Parade, Northampton.
* Sanford, John Burham, F.G.S., 13 Old Queen Street, St. James's Park, S.W.

Score, H. Berkeley, Lathom Park, Ormskirk.
SECCOMBE, Thomas, M.A., 45 Madeley Road, Ealing.
SEEBOHM, FREDERIC, LL.D., F.S.A., The Hermitage, Hitchin.
* Seebohm, Hugh Exton, M.A., The Hermitage, Hitchin.
Shannon, J. S., St. Martin's School, York.
Sherren, John Angel, J.P., Helmsley, Stavordale Road, Weymouth.
Short, R. M., Herbert Road, Solihull, near Birmingham.
Sidney, Philip, Royal Societies' Club, St. James's Street, S.W.
Sikes, Rev. Thomas B., M.A., Warbleton Rectory, Heathfield, Sussex.
* Simpson, Edward, Walton Hall, Wakefield.
Simpson, Percy, F.R.G.S., F.Z.S., Ocean Wave, St. Ives, Cornwall.
* Simson, Alfred, The Postern, Tonbridge, Kent.
Skeel, Miss C. A. J., Westfield College, Hampstead.
Smart, F. W. B., Charterhouse, Godalming.
Smith, A. L., M.A., The King's Mound, Oxford.
Smith, Hubert, Brooklynne, Willes Road, Leamington Spa, Warwickshire.
Smith, Samuel, Librarian, Public Libraries, Sheffield.
Smythe, David M., Methuen Castle, Perth.
Sotheran, H. C., 5 Cheyne Walk, Chelsea, S.W.
Southam, H. R. H., F.S.A., Innellan, Shrewsbury.
Southam, Lionel Arthur Clement, Rodney House, Malvern Link.
St. Cyres, Viscount, Pynes, Exeter.
Spry, William James Joseph, R.N., F.R.G.S., Therapia, 10 Craneswater Avenue, Craneswater Park, Southsea.
*Stanley, Walmsley, F.R.G.S., The Knowle, Leigham Court Rd., Streatham, S.W.
Stead, Richard, B.A., 20 Oakroyd Terrace, Bradford, Yorks.
Steele, Joseph, M.D., c/o Mr. Alderman Rymer, J.P., Wellesley Road, Croydon.
STEPHEN, Sir LESLIE, K.C.B., LL.D., 22 Hyde Park Gate, W.
STEVENSON, W. H., M.A., Public Record Office, W.C.
* Stewart, General Alexander P., LL.D.
Stockdale, Thomas.
* Strathcona and Mount Royal, The Right Hon. Lord, 28 Grosvenor Square, W.

Tanner, J. R., M.A., St. John's College, Cambridge.
* Taylor, Miss Helen, Avignon, France.
Taylor, R. W. Cooke, H.M. Factory Department, 39 Victoria Street, S.W.
Tedder, H. R., F.S.A., The Athenæum, Pall Mall, S.W.
* Teele, Rev. Albert K., D.D., Milton, Mass., U.S.A.
Terry, George P. W., 17 Gorst Road, Wandsworth Common, S.W.
Terry, Rev. G. F., All Souls' Vicarage, 88 Finchley Road, N.W.
Thompson, C. J. S., 3 Horeden Road, West Hampstead, N.W.
Thorp, John T., 57 Regent Road, Leicester.
Thornton, Percy M., M.P., Battersea Rise House, West Side, Clapham Common.
Thornton, Rev. Canon S., The Rectory, Downham, near Ely, Cambs.
THORNTON, The Ven. Archdeacon ROBINSON, D.D., 63 Ladbroke Grove, Notting Hill, W.
Thrupp, Miss Adelaide, Merrow House, near Guildford.
Titcombe, Rev. J. C., Seckford Hospital, Woodbridge.
Tompkins, H. W., Verulam, Honiton Road, Southend-on-Sea.
Torbitt, William S., B.A., Municipal Technical School, Hull.
Torbitt, James H.
Torr, Herbert James, Morton Hall, Swinderby, Lincoln.
Tout, Professor T. F., M.A., 21 Mauldeth Road, Withington, Manchester.

Traherne, Capt. George G., R.A., Coedarhydyglyn, Cardiff.
Traherne, L. E., Coedarhydyglyn, Cardiff.
Turner, Fred A., The Retreat, Whitestile Road, Brentford, W.
* Turton, Robert Bell, Kildale Hall, Grosmont, Yorks.
* Trevelyan, G. M., 8 Grosvenor Crescent, S.W.

Udal, The Hon. John Symonds, F.S.A., Chief Justice of the Leeward Islands, Antigua, West Indies.

Ventura, M., 18 Coleman Street, E.C.
Verney, Lady, Claydon House, Winslow, Bucks.
Vincent, J. A., Needham Market, Suffolk.

* Wagner, Henry, F.S.A., 13 Half Moon Street, Piccadilly, W.
Walford, John Edward, C.C., 73 Knightrider Street, E.C.
* Walker, Philip F., F.R.G.S., 36 Princes Gardens, S.W.
* Walker, Robert, F.R.G.S., Ormidale, Knighton Park Road, Leicester.
Walker, Thomas J., M.A., 37 Bristol Gardens, Maida Hill, W.
* Wallace, Sir Donald MacKenzie, St. Ermin's Mansions, Caxton Street, S.W.
Wallis, John E. P., M.A.
Walsh, Walter, 392 Clapham Road, S.W.
WARD, ADOLPHUS WILLIAM, Litt.D., LL.D., Master of Peterhouse, Cambridge.
Ward, John Edward, F.R.G.S., Woolmer Hill House, Haslemere.
Warren, Lieut-General Sir Charles, K.C.B., F.R.S., R.E., 10 Wellington Crescent, Ramsgate.
* Watson, Rev. Albert, M.A., 20 Norham Gardens, Oxford.
Watson, E. J., St. John's Arch, Bristol.
* Watts, Rev. Herbert C., The Manse, Stalbridge, Dorset.
Webb, Sidney, 141 Grosvenor Road, S.W.
Webb, T., 45 High Street, Andover.
Wedgwood, James I., Gowland Court, Chapter House Street, York.
Welby, The Right Hon. Lord, G.C.B., 11 Stratton Street, W.
Welch, Charles, P.S.A. Corporation Library, Guildhall, E.C.
Wesley, E. F., 28 Essex Street, Strand, W.C.
* Whatton, J. S., Turret Lodge, Frinton-on-Sea.
Wheeler, Frederic Evelyn, VIII. Langegasse 7, Vienna.
Whitehead, Sir James, Bart., Wilmington Manor, near Dartford, Kent.
*Whitehead, Rev. J. H., M.A.
Whiteway, R. S., Brownscombe, Shottermill, Surrey.
Whiteley, J. G., 223 West Lanvale Street, Baltimore, U.S.A.
Whitney, Rev. J. P., Bishop's College, Lennoxville, Quebec.
Whitwell, Robert J., 70 Banbury Road, Oxford.
Williams, E. P., Elmhurst, Westcombe Park Road, Blackheath, S.E.
* Williams, Rev. J. D., M.A.
Williams, Miss Margaret Elizabeth, 2 Hardman Street, Liverpool.
Williams, Richard, Celynog, Newtown, North Wales.
Williams, Dr. Thos. E. H., Junior United Service Club, Charles Street, S.W.
Williamson, John M., Melville House, Overhill Road, Dulwich, S.E.
Willis, W. R., 20 Portland Street, York.
Wilson, H. W., 144 Elgin Avenue, W.
Wood, William, 'Cécile,' 4 Rastell Avenue, Talford Park, Streatham Hill, S.W.

Woods, Sir Albert W., Garter King of Arms, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., F.S.A., 69 St. George's Road, Pimlico.
Woodroffe, Prof. Latham James, M.A., 81 Waterloo Road, Dublin.
*Worsfold, Thomas Cato, F.R.S.L., Addison House, Balham Hill, S.W.
Wright, Chas. M., Neale Lodge, Beulah Hill, Norwood, S.E.
Wright, W. H. K., Free Library, Plymouth.
Wurtzburg, John Henry, Clavering House, 2 De Gray Road, Leeds.
Wyatt-Davies, Ernest, M.A., 10 King's Parade, Cambridge.
Wyles, Thomas, F.G.S., The College, Buxton.

York, His Grace the Archbishop of, Bishopthorpe, York.
Young, Rev. David, D.D., 18 Castle Bar Road, Ealing, W.
Young, Hubert Edward, Claremont, Amersham Road, High Wycombe, Bucks.

HONORARY FELLOWS.

His Majesty King Leopold II., King of the Belgians.

His Majesty King Oscar II., King of Sweden and Norway.

*Brown, P. Hume, M.A., LL.D., Sir William Fraser, Professor of History in the University of Edinburgh, 15 Craiglie Drive, Edinburgh.

Crawford, The Right Hon. the Earl of, F.R.S., Haigh Hall, near Wigan, Lancs.
Crombie, Rev. J. M., M.A., F.L.S., Holmwood, Dorking, Surrey.

Dana, Edward S., Ph.D., New Haven, Connecticut, U.S.A.

Fayrer, Surgeon-General Sir Joseph, Bt., K.C.S.I., LL.D., M.D., K.H.P., F.R.S., Physician Extraordinary to the King, 16 Devonshire Street, Portland Place, London, W.

Gorostiraga, Don Angel de, National Archæological Society, Conde de Aranda 6, Madrid.

*Hewins, Professor W. A. S., M.A., Tooke Professor of Political Economy in King's College, London, The Rowans, Putney Common, S.W.

Liversidge, Professor A., M.A., F.R.S., University of Sydney, N.S.W.
*Lyte, Sir H. C. Maxwell, K.C.B., M.A., F.S.A., Deputy Keeper of the Public Records, 3 Portman Square, W.

Méldahl, Count, Vice-President of the Royal Academy of Arts, Copenhagen.
Monod, Professor Gabr., 108 Boulevard St.-Germain, Paris.
Montelius, Dr. Oscar, Society of Antiquaries, Sweden.
Montjau, M. Edouard M. de, Society of Ethnography, Paris.

Nares, Admiral Sir George, K.C.B., F.R.S., 5 Westminster Chambers, Victoria Street, London, S.W.

Oppert, M. Julius, Professor of Assyrian Philology and Archæology in the College of France.

Pomialovsky, His Excellency Professor John, Imperial University, St. Petersburg.
*Poole, R. L., M.A., Ph.D., University Lecturer in Diplomatic, Oxford, Mansel House, Museum Road, Oxford.
*Powell, F. York, Regius Professor of History, Oxford, Christ Church College, Oxford.

Roberts, Field-Marshal the Rt. Hon. Earl, K.G., United Service Club, London, S.W.

Slafter, Rev. Edmund F., A.M., D.D., 249 Berkeley Street, Boston, U.S.A.
Stanley, Sir H. M., G.C.B., D.C.L., LL.D., 2 Richmond Terrace, Whitehall, S.W.
Stieda, His Excellency Professor Dr. Ludwig, Königsberg University, Germany.

*Thompson, Sir Edward Maunde, K.C.B., D.C.L., LL.D., F.S.A., British Museum, W.C.

Waxel, Platon L. de, Ph.D., Vice-Director of the Chancery of Foreign Affairs, Place du Palais 6, St. Petersburg.

* Honorary Life Fellows under By-law IV. (since repealed).

CORRESPONDING MEMBERS.

Balzani, Count Ugo, D.C.L., 5 Via Vicenza, Rome.
Bémont, Chas., Directeur-Adjoint à l'Ecole des Hautes-Etudes, 9 Rue de Condé, Paris.
Bonwick, James, 39 Sprules Road, Brockley, S.E.
Brock, R. A., 517 West Marshall Street, Richmond, Virginia.
Broglie, Le Duc de, Rue Solférino, Paris.
Bülow, Dr. G. von, Stettin.
Busch, Professor Wilhelm, Ph.D., Neckarhalde 3F., Tübingen.

Davis, Hon. N. Darnell, C.M.G., Georgetown, British Guiana.
Delisle, Léopold, Membre de l'Institut, Administrateur Général de la Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.

Gross, Charles, Ph.D., Professor of History in Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

Jameson, Professor J. F., Ph.D., LL.D., Chicago University, U.S.A.

Lee, G. H., A.M., B.C.L., 113 Devonshire Street, Boston, U.S.A.
Liebermann, Professor Felix, Ph.D., LL.D., 10 Bendlerstrasse, Berlin, W.
Litton, Hon. Robert T., M.A., F.G.S., F.R.G.S., Hon. Sec. Historical Society of Australasia, 45 Queen Street, Melbourne.

Mijatovich, Chédomille, Ancien Ministre Plén. de S.M. le Roi de Servie, 16 Bedford Gardens, Campden Hill, W.

O'Reilly, P. S., M.D., St. Louis, Missouri, U.S.A.

Ravenell, H. E., Spartanburg, South Carolina, U.S.A.

Sarolea, Prof. Charles, Edinburgh University.
Sorel, Albert, Membre de l'Académie Française, 70 Rue d'Assar, Paris.

Theal, G. McCall, LL.D., c/o Agent-General, Cape of Good Hope, Victoria Street, S.W.

Villari, Professor P., Florence.
Vinogradoff, Professor Paul, 31 Broadwater Down, Tunbridge Wells, Kent.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBING LIBRARIES

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

Aberdeen University. Librarian, Peter J. Anderson.

Belfast, Queen's College. Librarian, A. L. Meissner.
Birmingham Library, Margaret Street. Librarian, Charles Edward Scarse.
Central Free Library, Ratcliffe Place, Birmingham. Librarian, A. Capel Shaw.
Bolton Public Free Library, Town Hall Square. Librarian, James K. Waite.
Bradford Subscription Library, 34 Darley Street, Bradford. Librarian, Miss Rhodes.
Brighton Public Library, Royal Pavilion. Librarian, F. W. Madden, M.R.A.S.
Bristol Museum and Reference Library, Queen's Road, Clifton. Librarian, L. Acland Taylor.

Cambridge, Girton College. Librarian, Miss Allen.
King's College. Librarian, G. Chawner, M.A.
St. Catherine's College. Librarian, Rev. W. T. Southward, M.A.
St. John's College. Librarian, J. B. Mullinger, M.A.
Trinity College. Librarian, Rev. R. Sinker, D.D.
University Library. Librarian, F. J. H. Jenkinson, M.A.
Canterbury, Dean and Chapter Library. Librarian,
Carlisle Public Library, Castle Street, Carlisle. Librarian, Rowland Hill.
Cheltenham Permanent Library. Librarian, J. T. Presley.

Dublin, King's Inn Library. Librarian, James McIvor.
National Library of Ireland, Kildare Street. Librarian, T. W. Lyster, M.A.
Royal Irish Academy, 19 Dawson Street. Librarian, John T. Gilbert, LL.D., F.S.A.
Durham University. Librarian, E. V. Stocks.

Edinburgh Library of the Writers to the 'Signet.' Librarian, Thomas Graves Law, LL.D.
University. Librarian, A. Anderson.

Glasgow, Baillie's Institution, 153 West Regent Street. Librarian, Wm. Simpson.
Faculty of Procurators' Library, 62 St. George's Place. Librarian, John Muir.
Mitchell Library, 21 Miller Street. Librarian, Francis T. Barrett.
University Library. Librarian, James Lymburn.

Gloucester Public Library, Brunswick Road. Librarian, Rowland Austin.

Hove Public Library. Librarian, J. W. Lister.
Hull Public Library. Librarian, William F. Lawton.

Ireland, National Library of (*see* Dublin).

Leeds Library, Commercial Street, Leeds. Librarian, David Augustus Cruse, M.A.
Leicester Free Library, Wellington Street. Librarian, Charles Vernon Kirkby.
Lincoln, Dean and Chapter Library.
Liverpool, Athenæum Library, 40 Church Street. Librarian, George T. Shaw.
London, Athenæum Club. Librarian, H. R. Tedder, F.S A.
Battersea Public Libraries, Lavender Hill, S.W. Librarian, Lawrence Inkster.
British Museum. Director, Sir Edward Maunde Thompson.
Gray's Inn. Librarian, Ralph Douthwaite.
Hammersmith Free Public Library. Librarian, Samuel Martin.
House of Commons. Librarian, R. C. Walpole.
Incorporated Law Society, Chancery Lane. Librarian, W. C. Frederick Boase.
Inner Temple. Librarian, J. E. Latton-Pickering.
Kensington Public Library. Librarian, H. Jones.
Lincoln's Inn. Librarian, A. F. Gray Etheridge.
London Institution, Finsbury Circus, E.C. Librarian, R. W. Frazer, LL.B., M.R.A.S.
London Library, St. James's Square, S.W. Librarian, C. H. Hagberg Wright, LL.D.
London University, Burlington Gardens.
Middle Temple. Librarian, John Hutchinson.
National Liberal Club, Whitehall, S.W. Librarian, F. G. Haley.
National Portrait Gallery.
New University Club, St. James's Street, S.W.
Oxford and Cambridge Club.
Public Record Office.
Reform Club, Pall Mall, S.W. Librarian, Charles W. Vincent.
St. George's Public Library, Buckingham Palace Road, S.W. Librarian, Frank Pacy.
St. Paul's Cathedral Library.
Sion College Library, Victoria Embankment, S.W. Librarian, Rev. W. H. Milman.
Westfield College, Hampstead, N.W. Librarian, Miss C. A. J. Skeel, M.A.
Westminster Public Library, Great Smith Street, S.W. Librarian, H. E. Poole.
Dr. Williams's Library, Gordon Square, W.C. Librarian, F. H. Jones.

Manchester Public Libraries. Librarian, Charles W. Sutton.
The Owens College. Librarian, W. E. Rhodes, M.A.
Middlesborough Free Library, Municipal Buildings. Librarian, Baker Hudson.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Literary and Philosophical Society. Librarian, Basil Anderton, B.A.

Newington Public Library, Walworth Road, S.E. Librarian, R. W. Mould.
Norfolk and Norwich Library.
Norwich, Dean and Chapter Library.
Nottingham Free Public Library. Librarian, J. Potter Briscoe.

Oldham, Union Street Library. Librarian, Robert Bateman.
Oxford, All Souls College. Librarian, Prof. C. W. Oman, M.A., F.S.A.
Balliol College. Librarian, John Alexander Smith, M.A.
Bodleian Library. Librarian, E. W. B. Nicholson, M.A.
Exeter College. Librarian, Rev. W. C. Allen, M.A.
Keble College.
Magdalen College. Librarian, H. A. Wilson, M.A.
Manchester College. Librarian, Miss L. Toulmin Smith.
Merton College. Librarian, B. W. Henderson, M.A.
Queen's College. Librarian, Rev. E. M. Walker, M.A.
St. John's College. Librarian, Rev. C. F. Burrey, M.A.
Union Society.

Preston Library (Dr. Shepherd's).

Reading Free Public Library, Blagrave Street. Librarian, Wm. H. Greenhaugh.
Rochdale Free Public Library, Esplanade. Librarian, George Hanson.

St. Andrews University. Librarian, James Maitland Anderson.
Southport Free Library. Librarian, Thoman Newman.
Stonyhurst College, Whalley, Lancs.

Windsor Royal Library, Windsor Castle. Librarian, Richard R. Holmes, F.S.A.

BRITISH COLONIES.

Adelaide Public Library, S. Australia. Librarian, J. G. R. Adams.
Melbourne Public Library, Victoria. Librarian, Dr. T. F. Bride.
New Zealand, General Assembly Library.
Pretoria Government Library, Pretoria, S. Africa. Librarian, R. W. Heaton, M.A.
Sydney University, New South Wales. Librarian, H. E. Barff.
Toronto Legislative Library, Canada. Librarian, Avern Pardoe.
Public Library, Canada. Librarian, James Bain.

FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

BELGIUM.

Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale. Librarian, E. Fétis.

DENMARK.

Copenhagen Royal Library. Chief Librarian, Dr. S. Birket Smith.

FRANCE.

Paris, Bibliothèque du Ministère de la Guerre. Librarian, A. Lemoine.
Bibliothèque Nationale. Director, Léopold Delisle.
Institut National.

GERMANY.

Berlin, Bibliothek des Deutschen Reichstages.
Königl. Bibliothek. General Director, Prof. Aug. Wilmanns.
Breslau, Königl. Universitäts-Bibliothek. Director, Wilhelm Erman.

Erlangen University.

Freiburg University Library. Chief Librarian, Prof. Dr. Julius Steup.

Göttingen, Königl. Universitäts-Bibliothek. Director, Prof. Karl Dziatzko.
Greifswald, Königl. Universitäts-Bibliothek. Director, Fritz Milkau.

Halle, Königl. Universitäts-Bibliothek. Director, Karl Gerhard.
Hamburg City Library. Librarian, Dr. Alfred Küster.
Heidelberg University Library. Chief Librarian, Prof. Jakob Wille.

Königsberg Königl. Universitäts-Bibliothek. Director, Karl Boysen.

Marburg, Königl. Universitäts-Bibliothek. Director, Johannes Rödiger.
Münich K. B. Hof- Staats-Bibliothek. Director, Dr. Georg v. Laubmann.

Prague University.

Strassburg, Kaiserliche Universitäts und Laudes-Bibliothek.

SWEDEN.

Stockholm Royal Library. Chief Librarian, Graf Karl Johan Gustav Snoilsky.

UNITED STATES.

Baltimore, Enoch Pratt Library. Librarian, Bernard C. Steiner, Ph.D.
Bethlehem, Lehigh University, South Pennsylvania. Librarian, H. A. Foering.
Boston Athenæum. Librarian, Charles K. Bolton.
Boston Public Library. Librarian, James L. Whitney.
Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine. Librarian, G. P. Little.
Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania. Librarian, Miss I. E. Ford.

California University Library, Berkeley, California. Assistant Librarian, J. D. Layman.

Chicago Public Library. Librarian, Frederick H. Hild.
Newberry Library. Librarian, J. V. Cheney.
University. Librarian, Zella Allen Dixon.
Cornell University Library, Ithaca, New York. Librarian, G. W. Harris.

Harvard University Library, Cambridge, Mass. Librarian, Wm. C. Lane.

Jersey City Free Library. Librarian, Miss Esther E. Burdick.

Massachusetts, Wellesley College. Librarian, Miss Lydia B. Godfrey.
Michigan, Detroit Public Library. Librarian, H. M. Utley.
Hoyt Public Library, Saginaw, East Side. Librarian, H. H. Ames.
State Library, Lansing. Librarian, Mrs. Mary C. Spencer.
University, Ann Arbor. Librarian, R. C. Davis.
Milwaukee Public Library. Librarian, G. W. Peckham.
Minneapolis, Athenæum Library.
Minnesota University. Librarian, Wm. W. Folwell.

Newark Free Public Library, New Jersey. Librarian, John Cotton Dana.
New York Public Library. Chief Librarian, J. S. Billings.
State Library. Librarian, Melvil Dewey.
Young Men's Christian Association. Librarian, Silas H. Berry.
Columbia University. Librarian, James H. Canfield.

Pennsylvania University. Librarian, Morris Jastrow.
Philadelphia Library Company. Librarian, J. G. Barnwell.
Pittsburg, Carnegie Library. Librarian, E. H. Anderson.
Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey. Librarian, E. C. Richardson.

San Francisco Free Public Library. Librarian, G. T. Clark.
Springfield City Library, Mass. Librarian, Hiller C. Wellmann.

Washington, Catholic University of America. Librarian, J. M. Cooney.
Congress Library. Librarian, Herbert Putnam.
Wisconsin, State Historical Society of. Librarian, I. S. Bradley.

Yale University, New Haven, Conn. Librarian, Addison Van Name.

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES IN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

WHICH EXCHANGE TRANSACTIONS WITH THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Society of Antiquaries, Burlington House, London, W.
Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, Queen Street, Edinburgh.
The Hon. Society of Cymmrodorion, 63 Chancery Lane, W.C.
East Herts Archæological Society, Bishop's Stortford.
Surrey Archæological Society, Guildford.

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES ABROAD

WHICH EXCHANGE TRANSACTIONS WITH THE SOCIETY.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

Kaiserl. Akad. der Wissenschaften, Vienna.
Königl. böhmischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Altstadt, c. N^{r}. 562, Prague.

BELGIUM.

Académie royale des Sciences, des Lettres et des Beaux-Arts, Palais des Académies, Brussels.
Académie Royale d'Archéologie de Belgique, Rue du Transvaal, 53, Antwerp.
Société d'Archéologie de Bruxelles, 11 Rue Ravenstein, Brussels.

CANADA.

Toronto University.
Archives of the Department of Agriculture, Ottawa.

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE.

South African Library, Cape Town.

DENMARK.

Société royale des Antiquaires du Nord, Copenhagen.

FRANCE.

Bibliothèque de l'Université de Toulouse, 2 Rue de l'Université, Toulouse, Haute-Garonne.
Société de l'Histoire de France, 60 Rue des Francs-Bourgeois, Paris.
Société d'Histoire Diplomatique, 18 Rue Vignon, Paris.
Société de l'Ecole Nationale des Chartes, 17 Rue de la Sorbonne, Paris.
Société des Antiquaires de l'Ouest, 20 Rue de l'Est, Poitiers.

GERMANY.

Historische Litteraturgesellschaft, Friedensstrasse 11, Berlin.

ITALY.

Reale Archivio, Florence.
Reale Academia Lucchese di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti, Lucca.
Reale Archivio di Stato, Firenze, Lucca.
Societa Romana di Storia Patria (Rome).

NEW SOUTH WALES.

Sydney Free Library.

NOVA SCOTIA.

The Nova Scotia Historical Society, Halifax, N.S.

PORTUGAL.

Academia Real das Sciencias, Lisbon.

ROUMANIA.

Academia Romana, Bucharest.

RUSSIA.

Russian Imperial Historical Society, St. Petersburg.
Société Impériale Russe d'Archéologie, St.-Pétersbourg.
Bibliothèque de l'Université impériale de Juriew, Juriew (Dorpat), Russia.

SOUTH AMERICA.

Academia Nacional de la Historia, Caraccas, Venezuela.

SPAIN.

Real Academia de la Historia, Calle del Leon, 21, Madrid.

SWEDEN.

Kongl. Vitterhets Historie Antiquitets Akademien, National Museum, Stockholm.
The Royal Society of Antiquaries of Sweden, Stockholm.

TASMANIA.

The Royal Society of Tasmania, Hobart.

UNITED STATES.

The Smithsonian Institution, Washington.
The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.
New England Historic-Genealogical Society, 18 Somerset Street, Boston, Mass.
The New York Historical Society, 170 Second Avenue, New York.
The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1,300 Locust Street, Philadelphia.
The Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.
The Rhode Island Historical Society, Providence, R.I.
The Virginia Historical Society, 707 East Franklin Street, Richmond, V.A.
The Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore.
The South Carolina Historical Society, Charleston, S.C.
The New Jersey Historical Society, 757 Broad Street, Newark, N.J.
The Maine Historical Society, Bath.
The New Hampshire State Library, Concord, U.S.A.
The Connecticut Historical Society, Hertford, Conn.
American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, Mass.

LIBRARIES TO WHICH THE SOCIETY'S TRANSACTIONS ARE PRESENTED.

Birmingham University Library.
South Kensington Museum.
Royal Institution, Albemarle Street, W.
Chetham's Library, Hunt's Bank, Manchester.
Imperial Institute, Imperial Institute Road, S.W.
Library of Political Science, Clare Market, W.C.

The Council are not responsible for the accuracy of the foregoing list, but they request that any inaccuracy or omission may be pointed out to the Secretary, and that all changes of address may be notified to him, so that delay in forwarding communications and the Publications of the Society may be avoided.

TRANSACTIONS AND PUBLICATIONS

OF THE

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.*

Transactions. Old Series. Vols. 1 to 10† (vol. 3 *out of print*).

Transactions. New Series. Vols. 1 to 17 (vol. 18 *in the press*).

England and Napoleon in 1803. Being the Despatches of Lord Whitworth and others. Edited by Oscar Browning, M.A. 8vo. 1887. 5*s*.

Walter of Henley's Husbandry, together with an anonymous Husbandry, Seneschaucie, and Robert Grosseteste's Rules. Edited by E. Lamond and W. Cunningham, D.D., Litt.D. 4to. 1890. 6*s*.

The Domesday of Inclosures, 1517–1518. Edited by I. . Leadam, M.A. 2 vols. 1897. 21*s*.

Bibliographies of the Right Hon. and Right Rev. Mandell Creighton, Bishop of London, the Right Rev. William Stubbs, Bishop of Oxford, Dr. S. R. Gardiner, and the Right Hon. John, Baron Acton. Edited by W. A. Shaw, Litt.D. 8vo. 1903. 2*s*. 6*d*.

Domesday Commemoration, 1886. Notes on the Manuscripts, &c., exhibited at H.M. Public Record Office. Vellum, 4to. 3*s*. 6*d*.

Gibbon Commemoration, 1894, Proceedings of the. Vellum, 4to. 3*s*. 6*d*.

[*For Publications since* 1897 *see pp.* 57–58.]

* These are only issued to Fellows and Subscribing Libraries. The price of the current number of the *Transactions* is 10*s*. 6*d*. Back numbers, New Series, 6*s*.; Old Series, 5*s*. Applications should be addressed to the Librarian, Royal Historical Society, 3 Old Serjeants' Inn, Chancery Lane, W.C.

† The earlier volumes of this Series were issued to Fellows in unbound parts. Any discrepancies in the lettering of bound volumes during this period are doubtless due to this circumstance.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE LATE CAMDEN SOCIETY,

CONTINUED (FROM 1897) AS THE CAMDEN SERIES OF THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.*

OLD SERIES.

1. Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV. in England (1471). Edited by J. Bruce. (*Out of print.*)
2. Kynge Johan. A Play in two Parts. By John Bale. Edited by J. P. Collier. (*Out of print.*)
3. Alliterative Poem on Deposition of Richard II.; Ricardi Madiston de Concordia inter Ric. II. et Civitatem London. Edited by T. Wright. (*Out of print.*)
4. Plumpton Correspondence. Letters written in the reigns of Edward IV., Richard III., Henry VII., and Henry VIII. Edited by Stapleton. (*Out of print.*)
5. Anecdotes and Traditions, illustrative of Early English History and Literature. Edited by W. J. Thoms. (*Out of print.*)
6. The Political Songs of England, from the reign of John to Edward II. Edited and translated by T. Wright. (*Out of print.*)
7. Annals of the First Four Years of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, by Sir J. Hayward. Edited by J. Bruce. (*Out of print.*)
8. Ecclesiastical Documents: viz.—1. A Brief History of the Bishoprick of Somerset from its Foundation to 1174. 2. Charters from the Library of Dr. Cox Macro. Published by the Rev. J. Hunter.
9. Speculi Britanniæ Pars: an historical and geographical Description of Essex, by John Norden, 1594. Edited by Sir H. Ellis.
10. A Chronicle of the First Thirteen Years of the reign of Edward IV., by John Warkworth, D.D. Edited by J. O. Halliwell.
11. Kemp's Nine Daies Wonder, performed in a Daunce from London to Norwich. Edited by Rev. A. Dyce. (*Out of print.*)
12. The Egerton Papers. Temp. Elizabeth and James I. Edited by J. P. Collier. (*Out of print.*)
13. Chronica Jocelini de Brakelonda, de rebus gestis Samsonis Abbatis Monasterii Sancti Edmundi. Edited by J. G. Rokewode. (*Out of print.*)
14. Narratives of the Contests in Ireland in 1641 and 1690. Edited by T. C. Croker.
15. The Chronicle of William de Rishanger, of the Barons' Wars, and the Miracles of Simon de Montfort. Edited by J. O. Halliwell. (*Out of print.*)
16. The Latin Poems commonly attributed to Walter Mapes. Edited by T. Wright. (*Out of print.*)
17. The Second Book of the Travels of Nicander Nucius, of Corcyra. Edited by Rev. J. A. Cramer.

* These are only issued to Fellows and Subscribing Libraries whose subscriptions are fully paid at the following prices:—

Old Series, 3*s.* 6*d.* to 5*s.* (according to size).
New Series, 5*s.* to 6*s.* (according to size).
Third Series, 6*s.*
Current volumes, 10*s.* 6*d.* each.

18. Three Early English Metrical Romances. Edited by J. Robson.

19. The Private Diary of Dr. John Dee, and the Catalogue of his Library of Manuscripts. Edited by J. O. Halliwell.

20. An Apology for Lollard Doctrines, attributed to Wicliffe. Edited by J. H. Todd. (*Out of print.*)

21. Rutland Papers. Original Documents illustrative of the Courts and Times of Henry VII. and Henry VIII. Edited by W. Jerdan.

22. The Diary of Dr. Thomas Cartwright, Bishop of Chester, from August 1686 to October 1687. Printed from the original MS. of the Rev. J. Hunter.

23. Original Letters of Eminent Literary Men of the Sixteenth, Seventeenth, and Eighteenth Centuries. Edited by Sir H. Ellis.

24. A Contemporary Narrative of the Proceedings against Dame Alice Kyteler, prosecuted for Sorcery in 1324, by Richard de Ledrede, Bishop of Ossory. Edited by T. Wright.

25. Promptorium Parvulorum sive Clericorum, Lexicon Anglo-Latinum Princeps, auctore fratre Galfrido Grammatico dicto, e Predicatoribus Lenne Episcopi, Northfolciensi, A.D. circa 1440. Edited by A. Way. Part I. (*Out of print.*) (*See* Nos. 54 and 89.)

26. Three Chapters of Letters relating to the Suppression of Monasteries. Edited by T. Wright. (*Out of print.*)

27. Correspondence of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leycester, 1585 and 1586. Edited by J. Bruce.

28. The French Chronicle of London. Depuis l'an 44 Hen. III. jusqu'à l'an 17 w. III. Edited by G. J. Aungier.

29. Three Books of Polydore Vergil's English History, comprising the Reigns of Henry VI., Edward IV., and Richard III. Edited by Sir H. Ellis.

30. The Thornton Romances. The Early English Metrical Romances of Perceval, Isumbras, Eglamour, and Degravant. Edited by J. O. Halliwell.

31. Verney Papers. Notes of Proceedings in the Long Parliament, temp. Charles I. Edited by J. Bruce.

32. The Autobiography of Sir John Bramston, K.B., of Skreens, in the Hundred of Chelmsford. Printed from the MS. of T. W. Bramston.

33. Letters from James, Earl of Perth, Lord Chancellor of Scotland, &c , to his Sister the Countess of Erroll, and other members of his Family. Edited by W. Jerdan.

34. De Antiquis Legibus Liber. Cronica Maiorum et Vicecomitum Londoniarum, 1178 to 1274. By T. Stapleton.

35. The Chronicle of Calais, in the reigns of Henry VII. and Henry VIII., to 1540. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

36. Polydore Vergil's English History, prior to the Norman Conquest. Edited by Sir H. Ellis.

37. A Relation, or rather a True Account, of the Isle of England, about 1500. Translated from the Italian by Charlotte Augusta Sneyd.

38. Documents relative to the Foundation and Antiquities of the Collegiate Church of Middleham, Co. York, and notices of the Castle and Town, Edited by Rev. W. Atthill.

39. The Camden Miscellany. Vol. I. :—1. Register and Chronicle of the Abbey of Aberconway. Edited by Sir H. Ellis. 2. Chronicle of the Rebellion in Lincolnshire, 1470. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 3. Bull of Pope Innocent VIII., on the Marriage of Henry VII. with Elizabeth of York. Communicated by J. P. Collier. 4. Journal of the Siege of Rouen, 1591. By Sir T. Coningsby. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 5. Letter from George Fleetwood to his Father, giving an account of the Battle of Lutzen. Edited by Sir P. de Malpas Grey Egerton, Bart. 6. Diary of Dr. Edward Lake, Archdeacon and Prebendary of Exeter, &c., in 1677 and 1678. Edited by G. P. Elliott.

40. A Commentary of the Services and Charges of William Lord Grey of Wilton, by his son Arthur Lord Grey of Wilton. Edited by Sir P. de Malpas Grey Egerton, Bart.

41. Diary of Walter Yonge, Justice of the Peace, and M.P. for Honiton. 1604 to 1628. Edited by G. Roberts.

42. The Diary of Henry Machyn, Citizen and Merchant Taylor of London, from 1550 to 1563. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

43. The Visitation of the County of Huntingdon under the authority of William Camden, Clarenceux King of Arms, 1613. Edited by Sir H. Ellis.

44. The Obituary of Richard Smyth, Secondary of the Poultry Compter, London. 1627 to 1674. Edited by Sir H. Ellis.

45. Certaine Considerations upon the Government of England. By Sir Roger Twysden, Kt. and Bart. Edited by J. M. Kemble.

46. Letters of Queen Elizabeth and James VI. of Scotland. Edited by J. Bruce.

47. Chronicon Petroburgense. Edited by T. Stapleton.

48. The Chronicle of Queen Jane, and two years of Queen Mary. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

49. Wills and Inventories, from the Registers of the Commissary of Bury St. Edmund's and the Archdeacon of Sudbury. Edited by S. Tymms.

50. Gualteri Mapes de Nugis Curialium Distinctiones quinque. Edited by T. Wright.

51. The Pylgrymage of Sir Richard Guylforde to the Holy Land, 1506. Edited by Sir H. Ellis.

52. Moneys received and paid for Secret Services of Charles II. and James II. 1679 to 1688. Edited by J. Y. Akerman.

53. Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London. Edited by J. G. Nichols. (*Out of print.*)

54. Promptorium Parvulorum. Vol. II. (*See* Nos. 25 and 89.)

55. The Camden Miscellany. Vol. II. :—1. Account of the Expenses of John of Brabant, and Henry and Thomas of Lancaster, 1292–3. Edited by J. Burtt. 2. Household Expenses of the Princess Elizabeth at Hatfield, 1551–2. Edited by Viscount Strangford. 3. The Request and Suite of a True-hearted Englishman, written by William Cholmley, Londyner, in 1553. Edited by W. J. Thoms. 4. The Discovery of the Jesuits' College in Clerkenwell in March, 1627–8. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 5. Trelawny Papers. Edited by W. D. Cooper. 6. Autobiography and Anecdotes, by William Taswell, D.D. Edited by G. P. Elliott. (*Out of print.*)

56. Letters and Papers of the Verney Family, to the end of 1639. Edited by J. Bruce. (*Out of print.*)

57. The Ancren Riwle. Rules and Duties of Monastic Life. Edited by J. Morton, B.D. (*Out of print.*)

58. Letters of the Lady Brilliana Harley. Edited by T. T. Lewis.

59. Household Expenses of Richard de Swinfield, Bishop of Hereford, 1289–90. (*See* No. 62.) (*Out of print.*)

60. Grants, &c., from the Crown during the reign of Edward V. and two Speeches for opening Parliament, by John Russell, Bishop of Lincoln, Lord Chancellor. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

61. The Camden Miscellany. Vol. III. :—1. Papers relating to Proceedings in Co. Kent, 1642–1646. Edited by R. Almack. 2. Ancient Biographical Poems, on the Duke of Norfolk, Viscount Hereford, the Earl of Essex, and Queen Elizabeth. Edited by J. P. Collier. 3. A Relation of some Abuses which are committed against the Common-Wealth, 1629. Edited by Sir F. Madden, K.H. 4. Inventories of the Wardrobes, &c., of Henry FitzRoy, Duke of Richmond. And of Katherine, Princess Dowager at Baynard's Castle. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

62. Household Book of Bishop Swinfield. Vol. II. (*See* No. 59.)

63. Letters of Charles I. to Queen Henrietta Maria. Edited by J. Bruce.

64. An English Chronicle of the reigns of Richard II., Henry IV., Henry V., and Henry VI. Edited by Rev. J. S. Davies, M.A.

65. The Knights Hospitallers of England, 1338. Edited by Rev. L. B. Larking, M.A. (*Out of print.*)

66. Diary of John Rous, Incumbent of Santon Downham, Suffolk, from 1625 to 1642. Edited by Mary Anne E. Green.

67. Trevelyan Papers prior to 1558. Edited by J. P. Collier. Part I. (*See* Nos. 84 and 105.)

68. Journal of the Very Rev. Rowland Davies, LL.D. Dean of Ross, 1688–1690. Edited by R. Caulfield, B.A.

69. The Domesday of St. Paul's, 1222; or Registrum de Visitatione Maneriorum per Robertum Decanum, &c. Edited by W. H. Hale.

70. Liber Famelicus of James Whitelocke, a Judge of the King's Bench in the reigns of James I. and Charles I. Edited by J. Bruce. (*Out of print.*)

71. Savile Correspondence. Temp. Charles II. and James II. Edited by W. D. Cooper.

72. The Romance of Blonde of Oxford and Jehan of Dammartin. By Philippe de Reimes, a Trouvère of the Thirteenth Century. Edited by M. Le Roux de Lincy.

73. The Camden Miscellany. Vol. IV. :—1. A London Chronicle during the Reigns of Henry VII. and Henry VIII. Edited by C. Hopper. 2. The Expenses of the Judges of Assize riding in the Western and Oxford Circuits, 1596–1601. Edited by W. D. Cooper. 3. The Skryvener's Play, The Incredulity of St. Thomas. Edited by J. P. Collier. 4. The Childe of Bristowe, a Poem by John Lydgate. Edited by C. Hopper. 5. Sir Edw. Lake's Account of his Interviews with Charles I. on being created a Baronet. Edited by T. P. Langmead. 6. The Letters of Pope to Atterbury, when in the Tower of London. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 7. Supplementary Note to the Discovery of the Jesuits' College in March, 1627–8. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

74. Diary of the Marches of the Royal Army during the great Civil War, kept by Ric. Symonds. Edited by C. E. Long.

75. Original Papers illustrative of the Life and Writings of John Milton. Edited by W. D. Hamilton.

76. Letters of George Lord Carew to Sir Thomas Roe, Ambassador to the Court of the Great Mogul, 1615–1617. Edited by J. Maclean. (*Out of print.*)

77. Narratives of the Days of the Reformation. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

78. Correspondence of James VI. of Scotland with Sir Robert Cecil and others in England, temp. Elizabeth. Edited by J. Bruce.

79. Letters written by John Chamberlain during the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Edited by Sarah Williams.

80. Proceedings, principally in Co. Kent, in connection with the Parliaments called in 1640. Edited by Rev. L. B. Larking.

81. Parliamentary Debates in 1610. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D.

82. Lists of Foreign Protestants, and Aliens, resident in England, 1618–1688. Edited by W. D. Cooper.

83. Wills from Doctors' Commons 1495–1695. Edited by J. G. Nichols. (*Out of print.*)

84. Trevelyan Papers. Part II. 1446–1643. Edited by J. P. Collier. (*See* Nos. 67 and 105.)

85. The Life of Marmaduke Rawdon of York. Edited by R. Davies.

86. Letters of Queen Margaret of Anjou and Bishop Beckington, and others. Temp. Henry V. and Henry VI. Edited by C. Monro.

87. The Camden Miscellany. Vol. V.:—1. Five Letters of Charles II. Communicated by the Marquis of Bristol. 2. Letter of the Council to Sir Thomas Lake. 3. Documents relating to Sir Walter Raleigh's last voyage. Communicated by S. R. Gardiner. 4. A Catalogue of Early English Miscellanies formerly in the Harleian Library. Edited by W. C. Hazlitt. 5. Letters selected from the collection of Autographs in the possession of William Tite, Esq. 6. Sir Francis Drake's Memorable Service done against the Spaniards in 1587. By Robert Leng, one of his co-adventurers. Edited by C. Hopper. 7. Inquiry into the Genuineness of a Letter dated February 3rd, 1613, signed "Mary Magdaline Davers."

88. Letters from Sir Robert Cecil to Sir George Carew. Edited by J. Maclean.

89. Promptorium Parvulorum. Part III. (*Out of print.*) (*See* Nos. 25 and 54.)

90. Letters and other Documents illustrating the Relations between England and Germany at the commencement of the Thirty Years' War. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D. (*See* No. 98.)

91. Registrum sive Liber Irrotularius et Consuetudinarius Prioratus Beatæ Mariæ Wigorniensis. By W. H. Hale.

92. Pope Alexander VII. and the College of Cardinals. By John Bargrave, D.D. Edited by J. C. Robertson.

93. Accounts and Papers relating to Mary Queen of Scots. Edited by A. J. Crosby and J. Bruce.

94. History from Marble. Compiled in the Reign of Charles II. by Thomas Dingley. Printed in Photolithography by Vincent Brooks. Edited by J. G. Nichols. Vol. I. (*Out of print.*) (*See* No. 97.)

95. Manipulus Vocabulorum. A Dictionary of English and Latin words, by Peter Levins, 1570. Edited by H. B. Wheatley.

96. Journal of a Voyage into the Mediterranean, by Sir Kenelm Digby, 1628. Edited by J. Bruce.

97. History from Marble. Vol. II. (*Out of print.*) (*See* No. 94.)

98. Letters and other Documents illustrating the relations between England and Germany at the commencement of the Thirty Years' War. Second series. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D. (*See* No. 90.)

99. Diary of John Manningham. 1602–3. Edited by W. Tite.

100. Notes of the Treaty carried on at Ripon between Charles I. and the Covenanters of Scotland, 1640, taken by Sir John Borough, Garter King of Arms. Edited by J. Bruce.

101. El hecho de los Tratados del Matrimonio pretendido por el Principe de Gales con la serenissima Infanta de España Maria, &c. Narrative of the Spanish Marriage Treaty. Edited and translated by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D.

102. Churchwarden's Accounts of the Town of Ludlow, in Shropshire, from 1540 to the end of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Edited by T. Wright.

103. Notes of the Debates of the House of Lords. By Henry Elsing, Clerk of the Parliament, 1621. Edited by S. R. Gardiner.

104. The Camden Miscellany. Vol. VI. :—1. Life of William Whittingham, Dean of Durham. Edited by Mary Anne E. Green. 2. The Earl of Bristol's Defence of his Negotiations in Spain. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D. Journal of Sir Francis Walsingham, December, 1570, to April, 1583. Edited by C. T. Martin.

105. Trevelyan Papers. Part III. Edited by Sir Walter and Sir Charles Trevelyan. (*See* Nos. 67 and 84.)

NEW SERIES.

1. The Fortescue Papers, principally consisting of letters on State affairs, collected by John Packer, Secretary to George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D. Consists chiefly of a miscellaneous collection of letters which were apparently thrown aside by the Duke of Buckingham after he had read them. One paper is of peculiar importance as relating to Raleigh's trial.

2. Letters and Papers of John Shillingford, Mayor of Exeter, A.D., 1447-1450. Edited by Stuart A. Moore. Valuable as throwing light on the practical working of our institutions and the administration of the law in the reign of Henry VI.

3. The Cheque Book of the Chapel Royal from the Reign of Elizabeth to the Accession of the House of Hanover. Edited by Dr. Rimbault. Full of notices of English Musicians connected with the Chapel, and of minute particulars of royal ceremonies, funerals, coronations, churchings, baptisms, marriages, &c. (*Out of print.*)

4. A True Relation of the Life and Death of William Bedell, Lord Bishop of Kilmore. Edited by Thomas Wharton Jones, F.R.S. Interesting not only for the light it throws on the working of the Church of Ireland at a most important period in its history, but also for the personal character of Bishop Bedell himself.

5. The Mayor of Bristol's Calendar, by Robert Ricart, Town Clerk of Bristol temp. Edward IV. Edited by L. Toulmin Smith. Illustrative of municipal antiquities.

Notes of Debates in the House of Commons in 1625. Edited from a MS. in the Library of Sir Rainald Knightley, Bart., by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D. Throws additional light on the quarrel between Charles I. and the House of Commons, and contains new facts relating to Sir John Eliot. (*Out of print.*)

7. A Military Memoir of Colonel Birch, Governor of Hereford during the Civil War. Edited by the late Rev. John Webb, M.A., F.S.A., and the Rev. T. W. Webb, M.A. A storehouse of curious facts relating to the period of the Civil War.

8 and 9. Letters addressed from London to Sir Joseph Williamson while Plenipotentiary at the Congress of Cologne in the year 1673. Edited by W. D. Christie, C.B. Two vols. Full of news from the Court of Charles II.

10. Account of the Executors of Richard, Bishop of London, 1303, and of the Executors of Thomas, Bishop of Exeter, 1310. Edited by the late Venerable W. H. Hale, M.A., and the Rev. H. T. Ellacombe, M.A., F.S.A. Full of curious details on the household and ecclesiastical furniture of a bishop of the fourteenth century.

11. Wriothesley's Chronicle of English Affairs from the accession of Henry VII. to the first year of Queen Elizabeth. Edited from a MS. in the possession of Major.-Gen. Lord Henry Percy, by W. D. Hamilton, F.S.A. Two vols. Contains particulars not in other chronicles of the period. The Editor has printed in an Appendix to the First Volume the records of the trial of Anne Boleyn. (*See* No. 20.)

12. Documents relating to the Quarrel between the Earl of Manchester and Oliver Cromwell; with Fragments of a Historical Preface by the late J. Bruce. Annotated and completed by Professor Masson. Gives information about the proceedings of Manchester and Cromwell from the battle of Marston Moor till after the second battle of Newbury, and also the arguments on both sides of the dispute which ensued.

13. Autobiography of Lady Halket, in the reigns of Charles I. and Charles II. Edited by the late John Gough Nichols, F.S.A. The subject is a pious lady of the days of the Commonwealth and the Restoration.

14. The Camden Miscellany, Vol. VII., containing :—1. Two Sermons preached by the Boy-Bishop. Edited by the late J. G. Nichols. With an Introduction by Dr. Rimbault. 2. Speech of Sir Robert Heath in the case of Alexander Leighton. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, with a Preface by the late J. Bruce. 3. Notes of Sir G. Croke's Judgment in the case of Ship Money. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 4. Letters relating to the Mission of Sir T. Roe to Gustavus Adolphus, 1629–1630. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 5. Accounts of the Expenditure in building Bodmin Church. Edited by the Rev. J. J. Wilkinson, M.A. Rector of Lanteglos.

15. Letters of Dean Prideaux. Edited by E. Maunde Thompson. The letters contain amusing descriptions of life at Oxford and in the country at the close of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth century.

16. Milton's Common Place Book. Edited by A. J. Horwood. It is unnecessary to point out the interest of Milton's notes and jottings on a variety of subjects, political, social, moral, and literary.

17. Historical Collections of a London Citizen in the Fifteenth Century. Edited by James Gairdner. Printed from a MS. The poem is a very graphic original account of the siege of Rouen by Henry V. The chronicle is unique, ending in the middle of Edward IV.'s reign.

18. Papers relating to the Life of William Prynne, with the Fragment of a Biographical Preface by the late J. Bruce. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D.

19. Christ Church Letters relating to the Priory of Christ Church, Canterbury. Edited by J. B. Sheppard. Mostly of the fifteenth century, and some of political importance, relating to embassies, &c.

20. Wriothesley's Chronicle. Vol. II. (*See* No. 11.) (*Out of print.*)

21. Harpsfield's Treatise of the Pretended Divorce between Henry VIII. and Catharine of Aragon. Edited by the Rev. N. Pocock. An early authority for many facts hitherto considered questionable concerning Henry VIII.'s reign, which are now more generally accepted than they were.

22. Correspondence of the Family of Hatton, 1601–1704. Vol. I. Edited by E. M. Thompson. Full of news and gossip. May be taken as a fair sample of the correspondence of a family of the higher classes in the seventeenth century. (*See* No. 23.)

23. The Hatton Correspondence. Vol. II. (*See* No. 22.)

24. Notes of the Debates in the House of Lords officially taken by H. Elsing, 1624 and 1626. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D.

25. The Œconomy of the Fleete. Edited by Dr. A. Jessopp. An account of the state of the Fleet Prison in the time of James I.

26. Documents relating to St. Paul's Cathedral. Edited by the Rev. W. Sparrow Simpson, D.D., F.S.A. Ranging from the thirteenth to the beginning of the eighteenth century.

27. The Hamilton Papers, 1638–1648. Edited from the Originals at Hamilton Palace by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D. Important for the history both of England and of Scotland during that troubled period.

28. Three Fifteenth Century Chronicles. Edited by James Gairdner. (*Out of print.*)

29. The Puritan Visitation of the University of Oxford. Edited by Professor Montagu Burrows, F.S.A.

30. Catholicon Anglicum. Edited by Sidney J. Herrtage. A mediæval Latin Glossary of great interest from a philological point of view. (*Out of print.*)

31. The Camden Miscellany, Vol. VIII., containing:—Four letters of the Earl of Strafford, and a Poem on his illness. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D. Memoir by Madame de Motteville on the Life of Henrietta Maria. Edited by M. G. Hanotaux. Papers relating to the Delinquency of Thomas Viscount Savile, 1642–1646; Five Letters from Richard Thompson to his brother Henry Thompson, of Escrick, afterwards M.P. for York. Edited by J. J. Cartwright, M.A. Papers relating to Secret Negotiations with Charles I. 1643–1644. Edited by Mrs. B. M. Gardiner. A Letter from the Earl of Manchester on the conduct of Cromwell; Letters addressed to the Earl of Lauderdale. Edited by Osmund Airy. Letters of the Duke of Monmouth. Edited by Sir George Duckett, Bart. Correspondence of the Family of Haddock, 1657–1719. Edited by Edward Maunde Thompson.

32. The Voyage to Cadiz in 1625. Edited by Dr. Grosart.

33. Diary and Letter Book of Gabriel Harvey, 1573–1580. Edited by Edward J. L. Scott, M.A. Throws light upon university life at Cambridge in the age of Elizabeth.

34. Selections from the Papers of the Duke of Lauderdale, temp. Car. II. Edited by Osmund Airy. Three Volumes. Vol. I. 1639–1667. Vol. II. 1667–1673. Vol. III. 1673–1679. Illustrative of the period of the Restoration in Scotland.

35. Political Memoranda of the Fifth Duke of Leeds. Edited by Oscar Browning, M.A.

36. The Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. 1667–73. (*See* No. 34.)

37. Papers relating to issue of the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. Edited by the Rev. N. Pocock.

38. The Lauderdale Papers. Vol. III. 1673–79. (*See* Nos. 34 and 36.)

39. Proceedings in the Star Chamber and Court of High Commission in the year 1632. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D.

40. The Correspondence of Sir Edward Nicholas, Secretary of State, and of his son Sir John Nicholas, Clerk to the Privy Council, Vol. I. Edited by George F. Warner, M.A. Supplementary to correspondence printed in Evelyn's Diary, with matter relating to the Court of Charles II. during his exile.

41. Custumals of Battle Abbey, temp. Edward I., from a Manuscript in the Public Record Office. Edited by S. R. Scargill Bird, F.S.A. Throws light on the tenure of land and manorial customs in the thirteenth century.

42. Bishop Pococke's Travels in England in 1750, &c. Edited by James J. Cartwright, M.A. Vol. I. (*See* No. 44.)

43. Monastic Visitations in the Diocese of Norwich. Edited by the Rev. Augustus Jessopp, D.D. These visitations show the state of monastic life in the diocese of Norwich on the eve of the Reformation.

44. Bishop Pococke's Travels in England. Vol. II. (*See* No. 42.)

45. Papers relating to the Impeachment of the Duke of Buckingham in 1626. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D.

46. Memoirs relating to Lord Torrington. Edited by John Knox Laughton, M.A., R.N. Illustrative of naval affairs in the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth century.

47. The Essex Papers. Vol. I. Edited by Osmund Airy. Contains new matter relating to the Court of Charles II. and to the government of Ireland in his reign.

48. Visitations of the Collegiate Church of Southwell. Edited by A. F. Leach, M.A., F.S.A. A set of visitations differing in character from those in No. 43, and most important to a complete study of clerical life in pre-Reformation times.

49. The Clarke Papers. Vol. I. Edited by C. H. Firth, M.A. More important for the life of Cromwell than any book published since the well-known work of Carlyle.

50. The Nicholas Papers. Vol. II. (*See* Nos. 40, 57, and 63.)

51. Accounts of the Obedientiars of Abingdon Abbey. Edited by R. E. G. Kirk.

52. Wardrobe Accounts of Henry Earl of Derby (afterwards Henry IV.). Edited by Miss Toulmin Smith, with the co-operation of the Historical Society of East Prussia. (*Out of print.*)

53. The Camden Miscellany, Vol. IX., containing:—1. Visitations of Churches in the Patronage of St. Paul's Cathedral. Edited by the Rev. W. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. 2. "The Spousells" of the Princess Mary, daughter of Henry VII., in 1508. Edited by James Gairdner. 3. Original Letters from the Bishops to the Privy Council in 1564. Edited by Miss Mary Bateson. 4. Papers relating to Thomas Wentworth, First Earl of Strafford. Edited by C. H. Firth, M.A. 5. Hamilton Papers, Addenda. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D. 6. Memoirs of Nathaniel, Lord Crewe. Edited by the Rev. Andrew Clark. 7. The Journal of Major Richard Ferrier, M.P., during a tour in France in 1687. Edited by Richard F. E. and John A. H. Ferrier.

54. The Clarke Papers. Vol. II. (*See* No. 49.)

55. Visitations of Churches belonging to St. Paul's Cathedra in 1297 and in 1458. Edited by W. Sparrow Simpson, D.D., F.S.A.

56. The Archpriest Controversy. Vol. I. Documents relating to the dissensions of the Roman Catholic Clergy, 1597–1602. Edited from the Petyt MSS., by T. G. Law.

57. Nicholas Papers. Vol. III. (*See* Nos. 40 and 50.)

58. The Archpriest Controversy. Vol. II. Edited by T. G. Law. (*See* No. 56.)

59. The Political Correspondence of the Duke of Newcastle, 1765–1767. Edited by Miss Mary Bateson.

60. The Narrative of General Venables, and other Papers relating to the Jamaica Expedition, 1655. Edited by C. H. Firth, M.A. (*Out of print.*)

61. The Clarke Papers. Vol. III. (*See* Nos. 49 and 54.)

62. The Clarke Papers. Vol. IV. (*See* Nos. 49, 54, and 61.)

63. The Nicholas Papers. Vol. IV. (*See* Nos. 40, 50, and 57.) [*In the Press.*]

THIRD SERIES.

1. The Cely Papers: a Correspondence between Merchants of the Staple in London and Calais, 1477–1487. Edited by H. E. Malden, M.A.

2. The Despatches and Correspondence of John 2nd Earl of Buckinghamshire, Ambassador to the Court of Catherine II., 1762–1765. Vol. I. Edited from the originals in the Foreign Office and in family MSS., by Mrs. D'Arcy Collyer.

3. The Earl of Buckinghamshire's Correspondence. Vol. II.

4. The Camden Miscellany. Vol. X.—The Journal of Roger Wilbraham, Master of Requests, *temp.* Elizabeth and James I. Edited by H. Spencer Scott. The Diary of Sir Philip Hoby, 1547–1560. Edited by Edgar Powell. Prince Rupert at Lisbon. Edited by the late S. R. Gardiner, D.C.L.

5. The Diplomatic Correspondence of William Perwich from Paris, 1669–1677. Edited from the Foreign State Papers by Miss M. B. Curran, formerly of Girton College, Cambridge.

6. Collectanea Anglo-Præmonstratensia. Edited from the Bodleian and Additional MSS., by the Right Rev. F. A. Gasquet, D.D. Vol. I.

Despatches relating to the Second and Third Coalitions against Napoleon, 1798–1807. Edited from the Foreign Office Correspondence, by J. W. Headlam, M.A. [*In the Press.*]

The Camden Miscellany. Vol. XI. [*In preparation.*]

The State Trials of 1289–1290. Edited from the unpublished Records, by Professor T. F. Tout, M.A. [*In preparation.*]

The Secret Service Expenditure of George III., 1770–1782. Edited by the late B. F. Stevens, F.S.A. [*In preparation.*]

Collectanea Anglo-Præmonstratensia. Vol. II. [*In preparation.*]

PUBLICATIONS

OF

LEARNED SOCIETIES, PERIODICALS, ETC.,

IN THE LIBRARY OF THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY, OCTOBER 31, 1902.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

PRAGUE.

Königliche böhmische Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften.

Abhandlungen der Königlichen Böhmischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften. Folge VI. Bd. 10–12, 1874. Folge VII. Bd. 1–4; 1886–92. Prague, 1879–1892.

Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft. Bd. 11 and 12, 1894–1895. Prague, 1894–1896.

Geschichte der Königlichen Böhmischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften Von Kalousek. Prague, 1885.

Norbert Heermann's Rosenberg'sche Chronik. Von Dr. Matthäus Klimesch. Prague, 1897.

Sitzungsberichte der Königl. Böhm. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, 1880–1902. Prague, 1881–1903. Jahresberichte, 1880–1902. Prague, 1880–1903.

VIENNA.

Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Bd. 24–48. Bd. 30–31 missing. Vienna, 1876–1903.

Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Bd. 82–145. Vienna, 1876–1903.

BELGIUM.

ANTWERP.

Académie Royale d'Archéologie de Belgique.

Annales. 5e Série. Vol. LII. T. II. Première Partie. Antwerp, 1898–1900.

Bulletins. 5e Série. Vol. I.

BRUXELLES.

Académie Royale des Sciences, des Lettres et des Beaux-Arts de Belgique.

Annuaire, 1878–1903 (wanting 1879 and 1880). Bruxelles, 1878–1903.

Bulletins. 2e Série. T. XLIII., XLV.–XLVII., L. Bruxelles, 1877–1880 3e Série. T. III.–XLI. Bruxelles, 1882–1903.

Mémoires Couronnés. T. XX.–XXVII. Bruxelles, 1868–1877.

Société d'Archéologie de Bruxelles.
Annales. T. I.–XVII. Bruxelles, 1887–1903.

LOUVAIN.

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, 1900–1903. Louvain.

CANADA.

MONTREAL.

Numismatic and Antiquarian Society.
The Canadian Antiquarian. Series I. Vols. I., III., IV., VI. Series III. Vols. I., II., III. Montreal, 1872–1900.

QUEBEC.

La Société Littéraire et Historique de Québec.
La Vie de Joseph François Perrault. Par P. B. Cosgrain. Quebec, 1898.

OTTAWA.

Department of Agriculture, Ottawa.
Canadian Archives. Ottawa, 1883–1901.

TORONTO.

Toronto University.
Studies. First Series. Vols. II.–VII. Toronto, 1897–1902.

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE.

CAPE TOWN.

Belangrijke Historische Dokumenten in de Kaap Kolonie. By George McCall Theal, LL.D. Cape Town, 1896.
Proclamations, Notices, and Regulations in Force in the Native Territories of the Cape Colony on July 20th, 1896. By George McCall Theal. Cape Town, 1896.
Records of the Cape Colony. Edited by George McCall Theal. Vols. I.–XVIII. (1793–1824.) Cape Town, 1897–1903.
Records of South-Eastern Africa. Edited by George McCall Theal. Vols. I.–IX. Cape Town, 1898–1903.

DENMARK.

COPENHAGEN.

Société Royale des Antiquaires du Nord.
Mémoires des Antiquaires du Nord. Copenhagen, 1850–1901.
Igála udgivet efter gomle Handskrifter Kongelige Nordiske Oldskrift Selskab. T. I.–II. Copenhagen, 1875.
Texte de l'Atlas de l'Archéologie du Nord. Copenhagen, 1860.

FRANCE.

PARIS.

Société de l'Ecole Nationale des Chartes.
Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes. Revue d'Erudition. T. LX.–LXIII. Paris, 1899–1902.
Société d'Histoire Diplomatique.
Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique. 14ième–17ième Années. Paris, 1900–1903.
Société de l'Histoire de France.
Annuaire-Bulletin. Paris, 1898–1902.
Revue Historique. T. LIV.–LXXXIII. Paris, 1894–1903.

POITIERS.

La Société des Antiquaires de l'Ouest.
Bulletins. 2e Série. Poitiers, 1902.
Bulletins et Mémoires. 2e Série. T. XXI.–XXVI. Poitiers, 1898–1902.

TOULOUSE.

Bibliothèque de l'Université de Toulouse.
Annales du Midi. Revue Archéologique, Historique et Philologique de la France Méridionale. Par Antoine Thomas. XI.–XIV. Années. Toulouse, 1899–1902.

GERMANY.

BERLIN.

Historische Litteraturgesellschaft.
Mittheilungen aus der Historischen Litteratur-Gesellschaft. Von Dr. F. Hirsch. Bd. VII.–XXXI. Berlin, 1879–1903.

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

BRADFORD.

The Bradford Historical and Antiquarian Society.
The Antiquary. Vols. I. and II. Bradford, 1888–1895.

DOUGLAS (ISLE OF MAN).

Manx Society.
Publications. Vols. II.–XXI., XXIV.–XXVIII. Douglas, 1860–1898.

EDINBURGH.

The Society of Antiquaries.
Proceedings, 1867–1868, 1871–1902. Edinburgh, 1867–1903.

HERTFORD.

East Herts Archæological Society.
Transactions. Vol. I. Parts I., II., III. Hertford, 1899–1900.

LONDON.

Royal Historical Society.
Publications, Camden. Old Series. Vols. I.–CV. London, 1838–1872.
Publications, Camden. New Series. Vols. I.–LXIII. London, 1871–1902.
Publications, Camden. Third Series. Vols I.–V. London, 1900–1903.
Transactions. Old Series. Vols. I.–X. London, 1875–1882.
Transactions. New Series. Vols. I.–XVI. London, 1884–1902.
Hampstead Antiquarian and Historical Society.
Transactions, 1898–1901. London, 1899–1902.
Harleian Society.
Publications. Vols. I.–LI. (1871–1903.) London, 1869–1903.
Publications. Register Section. Vols. I.–XXX. London, 1883–1903.
Pipe Roll Society.
Publications. Vols. I.–XXIV. London, 1884–1900.
Royal Institution.
Proceedings of the Royal Institution. Vols. VII.–X. inclusive. London, 1873–1884.
Selden Society.
Publications. Vol. II., 1888.
Hon. Society of Cymmrodorion.
Transactions. 1899–1902. London, 1903.
Y Cymmrodor. Vol. XIV., XVI. London, 1903.
Surrey Archæological Society.
Collections. Vols. VIII.–XVII. London, 1880–1902.
Yorkshire Archæological Society.
The Record Series. Vols. XXV. and XXVII. London, 1899.
English Historical Review. Vols. X.–XVIII. London, 1895–1903.
Gentleman's Magazine Library. English Topography. Parts III., VI., VII., VIII., IX., X., XI. Edited by G. Lawrence Gomme. London, 1893–1899.
Home Counties Magazine. Vols. I.–V. Edited by W. J. Hardy. London, 1899–1903.
Middlesex and Hertfordshire Notes and Queries. Vols. I.–IV. London, 1895–1898.
North Riding Record, Yorks. Vols. I.–IX., 1884–1891. New Series. Vols. I.–IV., 1894–1897. London, 1884–1897.

MANCHESTER.

Chetham Society.
Publications. Vols. CII.–CXIV. Manchester, 1878–1886.
Publications. New Series. Vols. I., LI. Manchester, 1883–1903.

OXFORD.

The Sacred Books of the East. Edited by Max Müller. Vols. I.–XLIX. (wanting Vols. XIV., XVIII., XXXII., XXXIII., XXXIV., XXXVII., and XLVIII.) Oxford, 1879–1894.

WORCESTER.

Worcester County Records. Vol. I. Division I. Documents relating to Quarter Sessions. Calendar of the Quarter Session Papers. Vol. I. 1591–1643. Worcester, 1900.

INDIA.

BENARES.

Selections from the Duncan Records. Vol. I. By A. Shakespear. Benares, 1873.
Society of Antiquaries. Archaelogia. Vols. LI.–LVIII. 1888–1902.

ITALY.

FLORENCE.

Reale Archivio—State Archives of Tuscany. T. XI.–XXV. 1888–1902.
Documente sulle Relazioni delle Città Toscane coll' Oriente Cristiano. Da Giuseppe Müller. Florence, 1879.
I Capitoli del Comune di Firenze. Inventario e Regesto. T. I. e II. Florence, 1866–1893.
I Diplomi Arabi del R. Archivio Fiorentino. Florence, 1863.
Inventario del R. Archivio di Stato in Lucca. T. I., II., III. Florence, 1872–1880.

LUCCA.

Reale Accademia Lucchese di Scienze.
Atti della Reale Accademia Lucchese. T. XV.–XXVI., XXVIII.–XXX. Lucca, 1855–1900.
Memorie e Documenti per servire alla Storia di Lucca. T. III., Pt. III., T. XI., Pt. II., T. XII., T. XIII., Pt. I. Lucca, 1867–1871.

NEW SOUTH WALES.

SYDNEY.

Historical Records of New South Wales. Vols. I.–VI. 1762–1808. Sydney, 1893–1898.

NOVA SCOTIA.

HALIFAX.

The Nova Scotia Historical Society.
The Nova Scotia Archives. Vol. II., 1900. A Calendar of Two Letter-Books and one Commission Book in the possession of the Government of Nova Scotia, 1713–1741. Halifax, 1900.
The Nova Scotia Historical Society Collections. Vols. I.–XI. (1878–1900). Halifax, 1879–1888.

PORTUGAL.

LISBON.

Academia Real das Sciencias.
Cartas de Alfonso de Albuquerque. Por Raymundo Antonio de Buhhão Pato T. I. Lisboa, 1884.
Corpo Diplomatico Portuguez contrudo os Actos e Relações Politicas e Diplomaticas de Portugal com as diversas Potencias do Mundo. T. I.–X. Lisboa, 1862–1891.
Decada 13 de Historia da India. Por Antonia Bocarro. Parte I.–II. Lisboa, 1876.
Demosthenes. A Oração da Coroa. Por José Maria Latino Coelho. Lisboa, 1877.
Documentos Remittidos da India. T. II.–IV. Lisboa, 1884–1893.
Historia da India Portugueza. Collecçao da Monumentos Ineditos. T. X. Lisboa, 1868.
Historia da Universidade de Coimbra. Por Theophilo Broga. T. I., 1289–1555; T. III., 1555–1700. Lisboa, 1892–1895.
Historia do Congo. Por Viconde de Paida Manso. Lisboa, 1877.
Historia do Infante Don Quarte, irmão de el rei Don João IV. T. I.–II. Lisboa, 1889–1890

Academia Real das Sciencias—*cont.*
Historia dos Estabelecimentos Scientificas, Litterarios e Artisticos de Portugal. Por José Silvestre Ribeiro. T. I.–VII., X.–XVIII. Lisboa, 1871–1893.
Historia dos Loberanos Mohametanos das Primeiras Quatro Dynastias, e de Parte da Quinta, que Reinarão na Mauritania. Por Fr. Jozé de Santo Antonio Moura. Lisboa, 1828.
Historia os descobrimentos Portuguezes e os de Colombo. Por Manuel Pinhiero Chagas. Lisboa, 1892.
Lendas da India, por Gaspar Correa. Collecçao de Monumentos Ineditos. T. I.–IV. Lisboa, 1859–1866.
Memorias. New Series. T. II.–VI. inclusive. Lisboa, 1865–1885.
Quadro Elementar das Relações Politicas e Diplomaticas de Portugal. Por Visconde de Santarem. T. III.–XVIII. inclusive. Lisboa, 1843–1860.
Portugalise Momumenta Historia.
Diplomata et Chartæ. T. I. Lisboa, 1857.
Inquisitiones. T. I. Lisboa, 1857.
Leges et Consuetudines. T. I. Lisboa, 1856.
Scriptores. T. I. Lisboa, 1856.

ROUMANIA.

BUCHAREST.

Academia Romana.
Acte si Documente relative la Istoria Renascerei. T. I.–VII. Bucharest, 1888–1892.
Analele Academiei. Seria II. T. XV.–XX. 1892–1898. Bucharest, 1893–1898.
Caroli I. Trei Deçi de Domine dī Regeliu. T. I.–II, 1866–1896. Bucharest, 1897.
Dictionariulu Lunbei. De A. T. Laurianu si T. C. Massimu. T. I.–II. Bucharest, 1871–1896.
Dictionarul Lunbei Istorice si Pompane a Romanilor. T. II.–IV. Etymologicum magnum Romaniæ. Bucharest, 1896–1898.
Documente Privitóre la Istoria. T. I.–X. Bucharest, 1887–97.
Fragmente zur Geschichte der Rumänen. Von Ludoxius Freiherrn. Bucharest, 1878.
Istoria Imperiulu Ottoman. Pt. I.–II. Bucharest, 1876.

RUSSIA.

JURIEW (DORPAT).

Bibliothèque de l'Université Impériale de Juriew.
Verhandlungen der Gelehrten Estnischen Gesellschaft zu Dorpat. Bd. 6–9, 16–20. Dorpat, 1871–1899.

ST. PETERSBURG.

The Imperial Archæological Society of St. Petersburg.
Ancient Russia. A monthly historical magazine. T. I.–VI., 1876–1878; T. XLIX.–LXXII., 1886–1891. St. Petersburg, 1876–1891.
Atlas in dem Kaukasus, by B. Dorn. St. Petersburg, 1895.
Letters and Papers of Peter the Great. T. I.–III., 1688–1705. St Petersburg, 1877–1893.
Mémoires de la Société d'Archéologie de Saint-Pétersbourg. Par Dr. B. de Köhne. T. II.–VI. St. Petersburg, 1848–1852.
Notes and Articles. T. I.–VIII. St. Petersburg, 1886–1896.
Report of Congress. Part I. St. Petersburg, 1876.

The Imperial Archæological Society of St. Petersburg—*cont.*
Vassili Vassilyevitch Grigorieff after his Letters and Works, 1816 1881. Compiled by W. P. Vesselovski. St. Petersburg, 1887.
Voyage to Roumelia. St. Petersburg, 1879.
The Imperial Historical Society.
Review. T. I.–CXVI. St. Petersburg, 1876–1903.

SPAIN.

MADRID.

Real Academia de la Historia.
Boletin de la Real Academia de la Historia. T. IV., VI., VII., X., XII., XV.–XLIII. Madrid, 1884–1903.
Collecion de Documentos ineditos de la Antiguas Posesiones Españolas de Ultramar. T. I.–II. Madrid, 1899.
Collecion de Obras Arabigos de Historia y Geografía. T. I. Madrid, 1867.
Condicion social de los Moriscos de España. Madrid, 1857.
Cortes de los Antiguos Reinos de Leon y de Castilla. T. I.–III. Madrid, 1861–1866.
Estado de los Mudejares de Castilla. Por Don Francisco Fernandez y Gonzalez. Madrid, 1866.
Examen Critico-Historico del influjo que tuvo en el Comercio, Industria y Poblacion de España su Dominacion en America. Por Don José Arias y Miranda. Madrid, 1854.
Examen de los Sucesos y Circumstancias qui motivaron el Compromiso de Caspe. Por Don Florencio Tauer. Madrid, 1855.
Historia Critica de los Falsos Chronicones. Por Don José Godoy Alcántara. Madrid, 1868.
Historia del Combate Naval de Lepanto. Por Don Cayetano Rosell. Madrid, 1853.
Juicio Critico del Feudalisimo en España. Madrid, 1856.
Juicio Critico y Significacion Politica de Don Alvaro de Luna. Por Don Juan Rizzo y Ramirez. Madrid, 1865.
Legis Romanæ Fragmenta ex Codice Palimpsesto. Madrid, 1896.
Memorias de Don Fernando IV. de Castilla. T. I. and II. Madrid, 1860.
Munda Pompeiana. Por Don José y D. Manuel C. Hurtado. Madrid, 1861.

SWEDEN.

GOTTENBERG.

Kögskolas Arsskrift. Bd. I.–IV. Gottenberg, 1895–1898.

STOCKHOLM.

KonglichenVitterhets Historie Antiquitets Akademien.
Handlingar. Bd. XXI.–XXVII.; XXX.–XXXII. Stockholm, 1861–1894.
Royal Society of Antiquaries of Sweden.
Bibliographie de l'Archéologie Préhistorique de la Suède pendant le XIX^e^ Siècle. Stockholm, 1875.
Minnespenningar öfver enskilda Svenska Män och Quinnor, af Bror Emil Hildebrand. Stockholm, 1860.
Svenska Foraminnesföreningens Tidskrift. Bd. I.–III. Stockholm, 1871–1876.
Svenska Sigiller från Medeltiden, af Bror Emil Hildebrand. Parte I. Stockholm, 1862.
Sveriges och Svenska Konungahusets Minnespenningar, af Bror Emil Hildebrand. Bd. I.–II. Stockholm, 1874 and 1875.
Urkunda till Stockholms Historia, Stads Priv egiebref. Pt. I.–II., 1423–1700. Stockholm, 1900.

TASMANIA.

Royal Society of Van Diemen's Land.
Papers and Proceedings of the Royal Society of Van Diemen's Land. Vols. I. and II. Tasmania, 1851–1854.

UNITED STATES.

CONNECTICUT (HERTFORD).

Connecticut Historical Society.
Collections. Vols. II.–IX. Hertford, 1870–1903.

MAINE (BATH).

Maine Historical Society.
Collections. Vols. I.–VII., Old Series. Bath, 1865–1876.
Collections. Second Series, Vols. I. and II. Bath, 1869–1877.
Publications. Bath, 1868–1870.

MARYLAND (BALTIMORE)

Johns Hopkins University.
University Studies. Series II., III., V., IX.–XX. Baltimore, 1884–1902.
Maryland Historical Society.
Archives of Maryland. Vols. I.–XXII. Baltimore, 1888–1903.
Fund Publications. Nos. I.–XXVI. Baltimore, 1867–1891.

SHL WITHDRAWN

MASSACHUSETTS (BOSTON).

Massachusetts Historical Society.
Proceedings. Vols. I., II., VI.–XI. Second Series. Boston, 1884–1897.
New England Historic and Genealogical Society.
Memoirs of several Deceased Members. Boston, 1878.
Memorial Biographies of the New England Historic and Genealogical Society. Vols. I.–IV., 1845–1862. Boston, 1880–1885.
The Register of the New England Historic and Genealogical Society. Vols. XXVI.–LVII. Boston, 1872–1903.
Peabody Education Fund.
Proceedings. Vol. I. Boston, 1875.
Institute Library.
Second Catalogue. Parts I.–VI. Boston, 1892–1896.
Prince Society.
Publications of the Prince Society.
American Colonisation. Boston, 1873.
Andros Tracts. Vols. I.–III. Boston, 1868–1874.
Champlain's Voyages. Vol. II., 1604–1610. Boston, 1878.
John Checkley; or, the Evolution of Religious Tolerance in Massachusetts Bay. Vols. I. and II. Boston, 1897.
John Wheelwright. Boston, 1876.
Voyages of the Northmen to America. Boston, 1877.

MICHIGAN (LANSING).

The Historical Society of Michigan.
Michigan Pioneer Collections. Vols. I. and II., 1874–1878. Lansing, 1877–1880.

MINNESOTA (ST. PAUL).

The Historical Society of Minnesota.
Collections of the Historical Society of Minnesota. Vols. I., II., V.–IX. St. Paul, 1872–1900.
Legislative Manual. St. Paul, 1891.
Minnesota in the Civil War and Indian War. Vols. I. and II., 1861–1865. St. Paul, 1890–1893.

NEBRASKA (LINCOLN).

Nebraska State Historical Society.
Transactions and Reports. Vols. I.–V. Lincoln, 1885–1893.

NEW HAMPSHIRE (CONCORD).

New Hampshire State Library.
Provincial Papers. Vols. I.–VII., 1623–1776. Concord, 1867–1873.
State Papers. Vols. VIII., XV.–XXIX. Concord, 1874–1896.
Town Papers. Vols. IX.–XIV. Concord, 1875–1885.

NEW JERSEY (NEWARK).

New Jersey Historical Society.
Archives Documents relating to the Colonial History of the State. First Series. Vols. I.–XXII. Newark, 1880–1900.
Biographical and Genealogical History of the City of Newark and Essex County, New Jersey. Vols. I. and II. Newark, 1898.
Collections of the New Jersey Historical Society. Vols. II., IV.–VII. Newark, 1847–1872.

NEW YORK. *See also* WASHINGTON.

American Historical Association.
American Historical Review. Vols. I.–VIII. New York, 1895–1903.
Holland Society of New York.
Year-book. New York, 1898.
New York Historical Society.
Collections. First Series. Vols. I.–IV. New York, 1811–1826.
Collections. Second Series. Vols. I.–III. New York, 1841–1857.
Collections. New York, 1871–1894.
Proceedings. New York, 1843–1849.
Smith's New York. Vols. I. and II. New York, 1829.
Oneida Historical Society.
Transactions for the Year 1881. Utica, New York, 1881.

PENNSYLVANIA (PHILADELPHIA).

Historical Society of Pennsylvania.
Dr. George Logan of Stenton. Edited by F. A. Logan. Philadelphia, 1899.
Historical Map of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia, 1875.
Memoirs of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Vols. I., V.–XII. Philadelphia, 1864–1876.
Publications of the University of Pennsylvania Series in Political Economy and Public Law. No. 14. Philadelphia, 1899.
The Pennsylvania Magazine. Vols. I.–XXVII. Philadelphia, 1877–1903.

RHODE ISLAND (PROVIDENCE).

Rhode Island Historical Society.
Proceedings of the Rhode Island Historical Society. Providence, 1872–1885.
Publications of the Rhode Island Historical Society. Vols. I.–VIII. Providence, 1893–1900.

Rhode Island Historical Society—*cont.*
Carthage and Tunis. By Amos Perry. Providence, 1869.
Collections of the Rhode Island Historical Society. Vols. I.–III., VI.–IX Providence, 1827–1897.
History of the Institute of Instruction of Rhode Island. By E. M. Stone. Providence, 1874.
System of Civil and Religious Liberty and treatment of the Indians. Providence, 1876.
The Early Records of the Town of Providence. Vols. I.–XVI. Providence, 1892–1901.

SOUTH CAROLINA (CHARLESTON).

South Carolina Historical Society.
Collections. Vols. I.–V. Charleston, 1857–1897.
Historical and Genealogical Magazine. Vols. I. and II. Charleston, 1900 and 1901.

VERMONT (MONTPELIER).

The Vermont Historical Society.
Collections of the Vermont Historical Society. Vols. I. and II. Montpelier, 1870–1871.

VIRGINIA (RICHMOND).

The Virginia Historical Society.
Collections of the Virginia Historical Society. New Series. Vols. I.–V., X., XI. Richmond, 1882–1892.
Virginia Magazine. Vol. 7–10. Richmond, 1900–1903.

WASHINGTON. *See also* NEW YORK.

American Historical Association.
Annual Report, 1889–1902. Washington, 1890–1902.
Fourth Report of the MSS. Commission. Correspondence of John C. Calhoun. Washington, 1900.
American Jewish Historical Society.
Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society. Nos. IV.–X. Washington, 1896–1902.

THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

Bureau of Ethnology. Bulletins. Vols. I.–XXIV. Washington, 1887–1892.
Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections. Vols. XIII.–XXVII., 1878–1883; XXXVII.–XLIII., 1898–1901. Washington, 1878–1901.
A Catalogue of Scientific and Technical Periodicals, 1665–1882. By H. Carrington Bolton. Washington, 1886.
A Select Bibliography of Chemistry, 1492–1892. By H. Carrington Bolton. Washington, 1893.
Catalogue of Publications of Foreign Societies in the Library of the Smithsonian Institution. Washington, 1859.
Meteorological Tables. Washington, 1897.
Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge. Vols. VI.–XXXII. Washington, 1854–1895.
Smithsonian Reports for the Years 1850–1902. Washington, 1850–1903.

Spottiswoode & Co. Ltd., Printers, New-street Square, London.

D861
1957